

Multi-Dimensional Stable Roommates in 2-Dimensional Euclidean Space

Jiehua Chen ✉

TU Vienna, Austria

Sanjukta Roy ✉

Faculty of Information Technology, Czech Technical University in Prague, Czech Republic;
TU Vienna, Austria

Abstract

We investigate the EUCLIDEAN d -DIMENSIONAL STABLE ROOMMATES problem, which asks whether a given set V of $d \cdot n$ points from the 2-dimensional Euclidean space can be partitioned into n disjoint (unordered) subsets $\Pi = \{V_1, \dots, V_n\}$ with $|V_i| = d$ for each $V_i \in \Pi$ such that Π is *stable*. Here, *stability* means that no point subset $W \subseteq V$ is blocking Π , and W is said to be *blocking* Π if $|W| = d$ such that $\sum_{w' \in W} \delta(w, w') < \sum_{v \in \Pi(w)} \delta(w, v)$ holds for each point $w \in W$, where $\Pi(w)$ denotes the subset $V_i \in \Pi$ which contains w and $\delta(a, b)$ denotes the Euclidean distance between points a and b . Complementing the existing known polynomial-time result for $d = 2$, we show that such polynomial-time algorithms cannot exist for any fixed number $d \geq 3$ unless $P=NP$. Our result for $d = 3$ answers a decade-long open question in the theory of Stable Matching and Hedonic Games [17, 1, 9, 25, 20].

2012 ACM Subject Classification Theory of computation \rightarrow Problems, reductions and completeness; Theory of computation \rightarrow Solution concepts in game theory; Theory of computation \rightarrow Computational geometry

Keywords and phrases stable matchings, multidimensional stable roommates, Euclidean preferences, coalition formation games, stable cores, NP-hardness

Digital Object Identifier 10.4230/LIPIcs.ESA.2022.32

Funding *Jiehua Chen*: Vienna Science and Technology Fund (WWTF) grant VRG18-012

Sanjukta Roy: This work was done when SR was affiliated with TU Vienna, and was supported by Vienna Science and Technology Fund (WWTF) grant VRG18-012



© CC-BY;

licensed under Creative Commons License CC-BY 4.0

30th Annual European Symposium on Algorithms (ESA 2022).

Editors: Shiri Chechik, Gonzalo Navarro, Eva Rotenberg, and Grzegorz Herman; Article No. 32; pp. 32:1–32:26



Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics

Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, Dagstuhl Publishing, Germany

1 Introduction

We study the computational complexity of a geometric and multi-dimensional variant of the classical stable matching problem, called EUCLIDEAN d -DIMENSIONAL STABLE ROOMMATES (EUCLID- d -SR). This problem is to decide whether a given set V of $d \cdot n$ agents, each represented by a point in the two-dimensional Euclidean space \mathcal{R}^2 , has a *d -dimensional stable matching* (in short, *d -stable matching*). Here, each agent $x \in V$ has a preference list over all (unordered) size- d agent sets containing x which is derived from the Euclidean distances between the points. More precisely, agent x *prefers* subset S to subset T if the sum of Euclidean distances from x to S is smaller than the sum of the distances to T . We call preferences over subsets of agents which are based on the sum of Euclidean distances *Euclidean preferences*. A *d -dimensional matching* is a partition of V into n disjoint agent subsets $\Pi = \{V_1, \dots, V_n\}$ with $|V_i| = d$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. In this way, each agent $v \in V$ is assigned to a subset in Π . An agent subset V' is *blocking* the d -dimensional matching Π if $|V'| = d$ and each agent in V' prefers V' to its “assigned” agent subset in Π . A *d -stable matchings* is a d -matchings that is not blocked by a subset of agents of size d .

When allowing agents to have arbitrary preferences, we arrive at the d -DIMENSIONAL STABLE ROOMMATES (d -SR) problem with 2-SR being equivalent to the classical STABLE ROOMMATES problem [13, 16]. It is well-known that *not* every instance of STABLE ROOMMATES admits a 2-stable matching, but deciding whether there exists one is polynomial-time solvable [16]. Fortunately, if we restrict the preferences to be Euclidean, then a 2-stable matching always exists and it can be found in polynomial time: Iteratively pick two remaining agents who are closest to each other and match them [1]. One may be tempted to apply this greedy approach to the case when $d = 3$. However, this would only work if it can find and match a triple of agents in each step such that this triple is the most preferred one of all three. Since such a “most-preferred” triple may not always exist, the prospects become less clear. Indeed, Arkin et al. [1] showed that not every instance of EUCLID-3-SR admits a 3-stable matching. To the best of our knowledge, nothing about the existence of EUCLID- d -SR is known for any fixed $d \geq 4$. In particular, the no instance by Arkin et al. will not work for any fixed $d \geq 4$. Arkin et al. left open the computational complexity of finding a 3-stable matching. The same question has been repeatedly asked since then [17, 20, 9, 25, 6]. Nevertheless, d -SR (i.e., for general preferences) has been known to be NP-complete for $d = 3$. Hence, it is of particular importance to search for natural restricted subcases, e.g., under Euclidean preferences, which may allow for efficient algorithms.

Our contribution. In this work, we aim at settling the computational complexity of EUCLID- d -SR for all fixed $d \geq 3$. Arkin et al. [1] showed that there is always a 3-dimensional matching which is approximately stable, which sparks hope for a polynomial-time algorithm for $d = 3$. We destroy such hope by showing that EUCLID-3-SR is NP-hard. We achieve this by reducing from an NP-complete planar variant of the EXACT COVER BY 3 SETS problem, where we make use of a novel chain gadget (see the orange and blue parts in Figure 3) and a star gadget (see Figure 1) which is adapted from the no-instance of Arkin et al. See the idea part in Section 3 for more details.

The same construction does not work for $d \geq 4$ since a no-instance for EUCLID-3-SR does not remain a no-instance for EUCLID-4-SR. However, we manage to derive two extended star structures, one for odd d and the other for even d (see the right and left figures of Figure 4, respectively), adapt the remaining component gadgets to show hardness for all fixed $d \geq 4$.

Together, we show the following.

► **Theorem 1.** EUCLID-d-SR is NP-complete for every fixed $d \geq 3$.

Related work. Knuth [18] proposed to generalize the well-known STABLE MARRIAGE problem (a bipartite restriction of the STABLE ROOMMATES problem) to the 3-dimensional case. There are many such generalized variants in the literature, including the NP-complete 3-SR problem [17]. Huang [15] strengthen the result by showing that 3-SR remains NP-hard even for *additive* preferences. Herein, each agent $x \in V$ has cardinal preferences $\mu_x: V \setminus \{x\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ over all other agents such that x *prefers* $\{x, s_1, s_2\}$ to $\{x, t_1, t_2\}$ if and only if $\mu_x(s_1) + \mu_x(s_2) > \mu_x(t_1) + \mu_x(t_2)$. Deineko and Woeginger [9] strengthen the result of Huang by showing that 3-SR remains NP-hard even for metric preferences: $\mu_x(y) = \mu_y(x) \geq 0$ and $\mu_x(y) + \mu_y(z) \leq \mu_x(z)$ such that x *prefers* $\{x, s_1, s_2\}$ to $\{x, t_1, t_2\}$ if and only if $\mu_x(s_1) + \mu_x(s_2) < \mu_x(t_1) + \mu_x(t_2)$. It is straightforward to see that Euclidean preferences are metric preferences and metric preferences are additive. We thus strengthen the results of Deineko and Woeginger, and Huang, by showing that the hardness remains even for Euclidean preferences. Recently, McKay and Manlove [21] strengthen the result of Huang [15] by showing that the NP-hardness remains even if the cardinal preferences are binary, i.e., $\mu_x(y) \in \{0, 1\}$ for all other agents y . This result is not comparable to ours since binary preferences and Euclidean preferences are not comparable. They also show that 3-SR becomes polynomial-time solvable when the preferences are binary and symmetric.

Multi-dimensional stable matchings are equivalent to the so-called *fixed-size stable cores* in hedonic games [11], where each coalition (i.e., a non-empty subset of agents) in the core must have the same size, and stability only needs to be guaranteed for any other coalition of the same size.¹ Hence, our NP-hardness result also transfers to the case of finding a fixed-size stable core in the scenario where the agents in the hedonic game have Euclidean preferences. Hedonic games have been studied under graphical preference models [10, 23], where there is an underlying social network (a directed graph) such that agents correspond to the vertices in the graph. The general idea is to assume that agents prefer to be with their own out-neighbors more than non-out-neighbors. The Euclidean preference model is related to the graphical preference model where the underlying graph is planar. However, the Euclidean model is more fine-grained and assumes that the intensity of the preferences also depends on the distance of the agents. Notably, under the graphical model, a stable core always exists and it can be found in linear time [10], but verifying whether a given partition is stable is NP-hard [7]. Hedonic games with fixed-size coalitions have been studied for other solution concepts such as strategy-proofness [26], Pareto optimality [8], and exchange stability [3].

Other generalized variants include the study of 3-stable matching with cyclic preferences [12, 4, 19], with preferences over individuals [17], and the study of the higher-dimensional case [6] and of other restricted preference domains [5]. We refer to the textbook by Manlove [20] for more references.

Paper outline. In Section 2, besides introducing necessary concepts and notations used throughout the paper, we describe a crucial star-structured instance of EUCLID-3-SR (see Example 2), which serves as a tool of our NP-hardness reduction. The proof of Theorem 1 is divided into two sections: In Section 3, we consider the case of $d = 3$ and show-case in detail how to combine the star-structured instance with two new gadgets, one for the local

¹ A stable core is a *partition* Π of the agents into disjoint coalitions such that no subset of agents would block the partition Π by forming its own new coalition.

replacement and one for the enforcement, to obtain NP-hardness. In Section 4, we show how to carefully adapt the star-structured instance (which only works for $d = 3$) and modify the reduction to show hardness for any fixed $d \geq 4$. We conclude in Section 5. Due to space constraints, some figures, examples, and (part of) the proofs for results marked by \star are deferred to the appendix.

2 Preliminaries

Given a non-negative integer t , we use “ $[t]$ ” (without any prefix) to denote the set $\{1, \dots, t\}$. Throughout the paper, if not stated explicitly, we assume that ε and ε_d are small fractional values with $0 < \varepsilon < 0.001$ and $0 < \varepsilon_d < \frac{1}{1000d}$, where $d \geq 3$. By “close to zero” we mean a value which is smaller than ε and ε_d .

For each fixed integer $d \geq 2$, an instance of EUCLIDEAN d -DIMENSIONAL STABLE ROOMMATES (EUCLID- d -SR) consists of a set $V = \{1, \dots, d \cdot n\}$ of $d \cdot n$ agents and an embedding $E: V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ of the agents into 2-dimensional Euclidean space. We call a non-empty subset $V' \subseteq V$ of agents a *coalition*. The preference list \succeq_x of each agent $x \in V$ over all possible size- d coalitions containing x is derived from the sum of the Euclidean distances from x to the coalition. More precisely, for each two size- d coalitions $S = \{x, a_1, \dots, a_{d-1}\}$ and $T = \{x, b_1, \dots, b_{d-1}\}$ containing x we say that x *weakly prefers* S to T , denoted as $S \succeq_x T$, if the following holds:

$$\sum_{j \in [d-1]} \delta(E(x), E(a_j)) \leq \sum_{j \in [d-1]} \delta(E(x), E(b_j)),$$

where $\delta(p, q) := \sqrt{(p[1] - q[1])^2 + (p[2] - q[2])^2}$. We use $S \succ_x T$ (i.e., x preferring S to T) and $S \sim_x T$ (i.e., x indifferent between S and T) to refer to the asymmetric and symmetric part of \succeq_x , respectively. To ease notation, for an agent x and a preference list \mathcal{L} over a subset \mathcal{F} of size- d coalitions, we use $\mathcal{L} \succ_x \dots$ to indicate that agent x prefers every size- d coalition in \mathcal{F} over every size- d coalition not in \mathcal{F} and her preferences over \mathcal{F} are according to \mathcal{L} . Further, we use the agent and her embedded points interchangeably, and the distance between two agents means the distance between their embedded points. For each agent x and each coalition $S \subseteq V$, we use $\delta(x, S)$ to refer to the sum of Euclidean distances from x to each member in S : $\delta(x, S) = \sum_{y \in S} \delta(x, y)$.

See the introduction for the definition of *d-matchings*, *blocking coalitions*, and *d-stable matchings*. Given a d -matching Π and an agent $x \in V$, let $\Pi(x)$ denote the coalition that contains x . The problem studied in this paper is defined as follows:

EUCLID- d -SR


Input: An agent set $V = \{1, \dots, d \cdot n\}$ and an embedding $E: V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$.

Question: Is there a d -stable matching?

Note that since stability for each fixed d can be checked in polynomial time, EUCLID- d -SR is contained in NP for every fixed d .

Not every EUCLID-3-SR instance admits a 3-stable matching. Arkin et al. [1] provided a star-structured instance which does not. In Example 2, we describe an *adapted* variant of their instance, which is a decisive component of our hardness reduction.

► **Example 2.** Consider an instance which contains *at least* 12 agents called $W = \{0, \dots, 11\}$ where the 12 agents are embedded as given in Figure 1. In the embedding of $W \setminus \{10, 11\}$, the five inner-most points, namely 0 to 4, form a regular pentagon with edge length a . For each $i \in \{0, \dots, 4\}$, the three points i , $i + 1 \bmod 5$, and $i + 5$ form a triangle with side



■ **Figure 1** A star-structured instance adapted from Arkin et al. [1]; see Example 2. We use different colors to highlight the distances between the points. For instance, the smallest distance between any two points is a (highlighted in green). We also draw a dashed circle of radius b , centered at point 5 to indicate that points both 10 and 11 are with distance smaller than b to 5.

lengths a, b, c such that $a < b < c < \ell$, where ℓ denotes the diagonal of the regular pentagon. Moreover, the angle θ at points $i + 1 \bmod 5$, i , $i + 5$ is at most 90 degrees. This ensures that the distance between points $(i + 1 \bmod 5) + 5$ and i is strictly larger than ℓ (we will use this fact later). Except for point 5 (marked in red), the closest neighbor of each point $i + 5$ is i , followed by $i + 1 \bmod 5$. Point 5's two closest neighbors are points 10 and 11 with $a < \delta(5, 10) < b$ and $a < \delta(5, 11) < b$, followed by points 0 and 1. The distance between 10 and 11 is close to zero, with the intention to ensure that every 3-stable matching must match them together. The distance from 10 (resp. 11) to any agent in $W \setminus \{5, 10, 11\}$ is larger than the diagonal length ℓ while the distance from 10 (resp. 11) to any agent not in W is larger than $\delta(5, 10) - \varepsilon$. Finally, the distance between any agent from $W \setminus \{10, 11\}$ to any agent *not* from $W \setminus \{10, 11\}$ is strictly larger than ℓ .

To specify the embedding of the agents from W , we use the polar coordinate system. We first fix the embeddings of 5, 10, 11 to ensure the distances between them are as stated above. Then, we fix points 0 and 1 and the centroid of the regular pentagon to ensure the distances satisfy $a < b < c < \ell$, and the angle θ at points 1, 0, 5 is at most 90 degrees, and the angle at points 0, 5, j , $j \in \{10, 11\}$, is more than 90 degrees. Once these points are fixed we can determine the other points by a simple calculation.

The instance of Arkin et al. [1] embeds the two extra points 10 and 11 differently than ours (see Example 2). Hence, their instance is a no-instance, while ours may be a yes-instance, provided some specific triple is matched together, formulated as follows:

► **Lemma 3.** *Every 3-stable matching of an instance satisfying the embedding described in Example 2 must contain triple $\{5, 10, 11\}$.*

Proof. Towards a contradiction, suppose that Π is a 3-stable matching with $\{5, 10, 11\} \notin \Pi$. We infer that $\{10, 11\} \subseteq \Pi(10)$ since otherwise $\{5, 10, 11\}$ is blocking Π due the following: $\delta(5, \Pi(5)) \geq \min(\delta(5, 10), \delta(5, 11)) + b > \delta(5, \{5, 10, 11\})$, and for each $x \in \{10, 11\}$ it holds that $\delta(x, \Pi(x)) \geq 2(\delta(x, 5) - \varepsilon) > \delta(x, 5) + \delta(10, 11)$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$. This implies that $\{10, 11\} \cap \Pi(5) = \emptyset$. Next, we observe that there must be a triple in Π that contains the two agents of at least one pentagon edge as otherwise $\{2, 3, 7\}$ is blocking: $\delta(2, \Pi(2)) \geq b + c > a + b$, $\delta(3, \Pi(3)) \geq b + c > a + c$, and $\delta(7, \Pi(7)) \geq b + \ell > b + c$. Thus, at least one triple in Π contains the agents of some pentagon edge, say $\{2, 3\}$; the other cases are analogous. Let $\{2, 3, x\} \in \Pi$. We distinguish between three subcases:

Case 1: $x \notin \{1, 4, 7, 8\}$. Then, one can verify that $\{2, 3, 7\}$ is blocking; recall that every

agent not in $W \setminus \{2, 3\}$ is at distance larger than ℓ to agent 7.

Case 2: $x \in \{1, 7\}$. Then, $\Pi(4) = \{0, 4, 9\}$ or $\Pi(4) = \{0, 4, 8\}$ since otherwise $\{3, 4, 8\}$ blocks Π due to: $\delta(3, \Pi(3)) \geq a + \min(\delta(3, 1), \delta(3, 7)) = a + c > a + b$, $\delta(4, \Pi(4)) > a + c$, $\delta(8, \Pi(8)) > b + c$ (recall that the distance from every agent not in $W \setminus \{3, 4\}$ to agent 8 is larger than ℓ). However, both cases imply that $\{0, 1, 5\}$ is blocking since $\delta(0, \Pi(0)) \geq a + c > a + b = \delta(0, \{0, 1, 5\})$, $\delta(1, \Pi(1)) \geq a + \ell > a + c = \delta(1, \{0, 1, 5\})$, and $\delta(5, \Pi(5)) \geq c + \ell > b + c = \delta(5, \{0, 1, 5\})$; recall that $\Pi(5) \cap \{10, 11\} = \emptyset$.

Case 3: $x \in \{4, 8\}$. Then, $\delta(2, \Pi(2)) \geq a + \ell > a + c$. This implies that $\{0, 1, 6\} \in \Pi$ since otherwise $\{1, 2, 6\}$ is blocking Π . However, this implies that $\{0, 4, 9\}$ is blocking Π .

Since we have just shown that no agent x exists which is in the same triple as 2 and 3, no 3-stable matching exists that does not contain $\{5, 10, 11\}$. ◀

3 NP-hardness for EUCLID-3-SR

In this section, we prove Theorem 1 for the case of $d = 3$ by providing a polynomial reduction from the NP-complete PLANAR AND CUBIC EXACT COVER BY 3 SETS problem [22], which is an NP-complete restricted variant of the EXACT COVER BY 3 SETS problem [14].

PLANAR AND CUBIC EXACT COVER BY 3 SETS (PC-X3C)

Input: A $3n$ -element set $X = \{1, \dots, 3n\}$ and a collection $\mathcal{S} = (S_1, \dots, S_m)$ of 3-element subsets of X of cardinality $3n$ such that each element occurs in exactly three sets and the associated graph is planar.

Question: Does \mathcal{S} contain an *exact cover* for X , i.e., a subcollection $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ such that each element of X occurs in exactly one member of \mathcal{K} ?

Herein, given a PC-X3C instance $I = (X, \mathcal{S})$, the associated graph of I , denoted as $G(I)$, is a bipartite graph $G(I) = (U \uplus W, E)$ on two partite vertex sets $U = \{u_i \mid i \in X\}$ and $W = \{w_j \mid S_j \in \mathcal{S}\}$ such that there exists an edge $e = \{u_i, w_j\} \in E$ if and only if $i \in S_j$. We call the vertices in U and W the *element-vertices* and the *set-vertices*, respectively.


In our reduction, we crucially utilize the fact that the associated graph G of the input instance is planar and cubic, and hence by Valiant [24] admits a specific planar embedding in \mathbb{Z}^2 , called *orthogonal drawing*, which maps each vertex to an integer grid point and each edge to a chain of non-overlapping horizontal and vertical segments along the grid (except at the endpoints). To simplify the description of the reduction, we use the following more restricted orthogonal drawing:

► **Proposition 4** ([2]). *In polynomial time, a planar graph with maximum vertex degree three can be embedded in the grid \mathbb{Z}^2 such that its vertices are at the integer grid points and its edges are drawn using at most one horizontal and one vertical segment in the grid.*

We call the intersection point of the horizontal and vertical segments the *bending point*.

3.1 The construction

The idea. Given an instance $I = (X, \mathcal{S})$ of PC-X3C, we first use Proposition 4 to embed the associated graph $G(I) = (U \uplus W, E)$ into a 2-dimensional grid with edges drawn using line segments of length at least $L \geq 200$, and with parallel lines at least $4L$ grid squares apart. The idea is to replace each element-vertex $u_i \in U$ with four agents which form a “star” with three close-by “leaves” (see Figure 2a). These leaves one-to-one correspond to the sets S_j with $i \in S_j$. In this way, exactly one set S_j is unmatched with the center and will be chosen to the exact cover solution. Furthermore, we replace each set-vertex $w_j \in W$ with three



■ **Figure 2** Element- and set-gadgets described in Subsection 3.1.

agents $w_j^i, i \in S_j$, which form an equilateral triangle (see Figure 2b). We replace each edge in $G(I)$ with a chain of copies of three agents, which, together with a private enforcement gadget (the star structure with a tail in Figure 3), ensure that either all three agents w_j^i are matched in the same triple (indicating that the corresponding set is in the solution) or none of them is matched in the same triple (indicating that the corresponding set is not in the solution). The agents in the star structure can be embedded “far” from other agents due to the tail.

Gadgets for the elements and the sets. For each element-vertex $u_i \in U$, assume that the three connecting edges in $G(I)$ are going horizontally to the right (rightward), vertically up (upward), and vertically down (downward); we can mirror the coordinate system if this is not the case. Let w_j, w_k, w_r denote the set-vertices on the endpoints of the rightward, upward, and downward edge, respectively. We create four element-agents, called u_i, u_i^j, u_i^k , and u_i^r . We embed them into \mathbb{R}^2 in such a way that u_i^j, u_i^k, u_i^r are on the segment of the rightward, upward, and downward edge, respectively, and are of equal distance 8 to each other. Agent u_i is in the center of the other three agents. See Figure 2a for an illustration.

Similarly, for each set-vertex $w_j \in W$, assume that the three connecting edges in $G(I)$ are going rightward, leftward, and upward, connecting the element-vertices u_i, u_p, u_q , respectively. We create three set-agents, called w_j^i, w_j^p, w_j^q . We embed them into \mathbb{R}^2 in such a way that w_j^i, w_j^p, w_j^q are on the segment of the rightward, leftward, and upward edge, respectively, and are of equidistance 10 to each other. See Figure 2b for an illustration.

The edge- and the enforcement gadget. For each edge $e = \{u_i, w_j\}$ in $G(I)$, we create \hat{n} (a constant value to be determined later) copies of the triple $A_i^j[z] = \{\alpha_i^j[z], \beta_i^j[z], \gamma_i^j[z]\}$, $1 \leq z \leq \hat{n}$, of agents and embed them around the line segments of edge e in the grid (refer to Figure 3). To connect to the set-gadget, we merge agent $\gamma_i^j[\hat{n}]$ and set-agent w_j^i together. For technical reasons, we also use $\gamma_i^j[0]$ to refer to u_i^j . To define the distances, let $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \dots, \varepsilon_{2\hat{n}}$ be a sequence of increasing positive values with $2(2\hat{n} - 1)/(2\hat{n} + 1) \leq \varepsilon_{2\hat{n}-1} \leq 2(2\hat{n} - 1)/(2\hat{n}) < \varepsilon_{2\hat{n}} = 2 - \varepsilon$. Now, we embed the newly added agents so that the distances between “consecutive agents” on the line increase with $z \in [\hat{n}]$:

- The distance between agents $\alpha_i^j[z]$ and $\beta_i^j[z]$ (marked in blue) is close to zero.
- The distance between agents $\alpha_i^j[z]$ (resp. $\beta_i^j[z]$) and $\gamma_i^j[z]$ is $8 + \varepsilon_{2z}$.
- The distance between $\alpha_i^j[z]$ (resp. $\beta_i^j[z]$) and $\gamma_i^j[z - 1]$ is $8 + \varepsilon_{2z-1}$.

In this manner, we will ensure that either all $A_i^j[z], z \in [\hat{n} - 1]$, or all $\{\gamma_i^j[z - 1], \alpha_i^j[z], \beta_i^j[z]\}, i \in [\hat{n}]$ belong to a 3-stable matching (to be proved later).




Figure 3 Gadget for edge $\{u_i, w_j\}$ in $G(I)$ with $S_j = \{i, p, q\}$. Here, the fractional values ε_z satisfy $0 < \varepsilon_1 < \dots < \varepsilon_{\hat{n}} = 2 - \varepsilon$. The star-gadget, adapted from Arkin et al. [1], is described in Example 2. To highlight the distances between the points in the star-gadget, we use different colors. For instance, the smallest distance between any two points in the star is a (highlighted in green). We also draw a dashed circle of radius b , centered at point 5 to indicate that points both 10 and 11 are with distance smaller than b to 5.

To determine the value \hat{n} , let the lengths of the segments for edge $\{u_i, w_j\}$ in the orthogonal drawing of graph $G(I)$ be L_1 and L_2 , respectively; L_2 is zero if there is only one straight segment. We set \hat{n} to the largest value satisfying $\sum_{z=1}^{2\hat{n}} (8 + 0.01 \cdot z) \leq L_1 + L_2$, which is clearly a constant. For brevity's sake, when using \hat{n} , we mean the constant associated to an edge $\{u_i, w_j\}$ in the drawing which will be clear from the context. It is also fairly straightforward to check that one can choose the sequence ε_i so that the bending point of the chain is some agent $\gamma_i^j[z']$, $z' \in [n - 1]$ as shown in Figure 3.

By the construction of the gadgets above, each set-agent w_j^i strictly prefers triple $A_i^j[\hat{n}]$ to triple $\{w_j^i, w_j^p, w_j^q\}$ since $\delta(w_j^i, x) < 10 = \delta(w_j^i, y)$ for all $x \in \{\alpha_i^j[\hat{n}], \beta_i^j[\hat{n}]\}$ and $y \in \{w_j^p, w_j^q\}$; recall that $w_j^i = \gamma_i^j[\hat{n}]$ and $\delta(x, \gamma_i^j[\hat{n}]) = 10 - \varepsilon$. To ensure that exactly one of the two triples

is chosen, we make use of the star-gadget from Example 2. More precisely, we introduce an agent triple $H_j^i = \{f_j^i, g_j^i, h_j^i\}$ and embed them in such a way that the distances between two “consecutive” agents on the line towards the star-gadget increase:

- The distance between f_j^i and g_j^i is close to zero.
 - The distance between agent h_j^i and each of $\{f_j^i, g_j^i\}$ is $10 + 2\varepsilon$.
 - The distance between f_j^i (resp. g_j^i) and each of $A_i^j[\hat{n}]$ is in range $[10 + \varepsilon, 10 + 2\varepsilon]$.
- This means that the most preferred triple of agent h_j^i is H_j^i , while both f_j^i and g_j^i prefer triple S to H_j^i where $S = \{f_j^i, g_j^i, x\}$ and $x \in A_i^j[\hat{n}]$.

Finally, we create 12 agents, namely, $W = \{0, \dots, 11\}$, according to Example 2 such that agents 10 and 11’s most preferred triple is $\{10, 11, h_j^i\}$, followed by $\{5, 10, 11\}$. More precisely:

- The distance between agent 10 (resp. agent 11) and h_j^i is $10 + 3\varepsilon$.
- The distance between agent 10 (resp. agent 11) and 5 is $10 + 4\varepsilon$.
- The five agents from $\{0, \dots, 4\}$ form a regular pentagon with edge length a . Each two agents on the pentagon form with a private agent a triangle with edge lengths a (marked in green), b (marked in red), and c . We set $b = 10.1$ and $c = 10.2$. The length of the diagonal of the pentagon is ℓ .

Altogether, the lengths satisfy the relation $a < b < c < \ell$ and the specific angle θ is at most 90 degrees. Due to the chain, including f_j^i , g_j^i , and h_j^i , the distance from every agent not from $W \cup \{h_j^i\}$ to every agent from W is larger than ℓ . We call the gadget, consisting of the star-agents and the triple H_j^i , the *star-gadget* for set-agent w_j^i and element-agent u_i^j . Figure 3 provides an illustration of how the element-gadget, the set-gadget, and the star-gadget are embedded. Note that since the angle between any two line segments is 90 degrees and the line segment has length at least 200, we can make sure that such embedding is feasible.

This completes the description of the construction, which clearly can be done in polynomial time. In total, we constructed $O(4 \cdot 3n + 3 \cdot 3n + 3 \cdot 2\hat{n} \cdot 3n + 15 \cdot 3n) = O(n)$ agents. Note that we only need to have a good approximation of the embedding of the agents in the star-gadget and the equilateral triangle.

3.2 The correctness proof for $d = 3$

Before we proceed with the correctness proof, we summarize the preferences derived from the embedding via the the following observation.

► **Observation 5** (★). *For each element $i \in X$ and each set $S_j \in \mathcal{S}$ with $S_j = \{i, p, q\}$, let $0, \dots, 11$ denote the 12 agents in the associated star-gadget. Then, the following holds.*

- (i) *The preference list of each agent $x \in \{10, 11\}$ satisfies $\{h_j^i, 10, 11\} \succ_x \dots$.*
- (ii) *For each triple $B \neq \{h_j^i, f_j^i, g_j^i\}$ with $B \succeq_{h_j^i} \{h_j^i, 10, 11\}$ it holds that $B \cap \{10, 11\} \neq \emptyset$.*
- (iii) *For each agent $x \in \{f_j^i, g_j^i\}$ and each triple $B \neq \{f_j^i, g_j^i, h_j^i\}$:*
 - *If $B = \{f_j^i, g_j^i, y\}$ (where $y \in \{\alpha_i^j[\hat{n}], \beta_i^j[\hat{n}], \gamma_i^j[\hat{n}]\}$), then $B \succ_x \{f_j^i, g_j^i, h_j^i\}$.*
 - *If $B \succeq_x \{f_j^i, g_j^i, h_j^i\}$, then $B = \{f_j^i, g_j^i, y\}$ for some $y \in \{\alpha_i^j[\hat{n}], \beta_i^j[\hat{n}], \gamma_i^j[\hat{n}]\}$.*
- (iv) *For each $z \in [\hat{n}]$ the preference list of agent $\gamma_i^j[z]$ satisfies $\{\alpha_i^j[z], \beta_i^j[z], \gamma_i^j[z]\} \succ_{\gamma_i^j[z]} \dots$.*
- (v) *For each $z \in [\hat{n}]$ the preference list of each agent $x \in \{\alpha_i^j[z], \beta_i^j[z]\}$ satisfies $\{\alpha_i^j[z], \beta_i^j[z], \gamma_i^j[z-1]\} \succ_x \{\alpha_i^j[z], \beta_i^j[z], \gamma_i^j[z]\} \succ_x \dots$.*
- (vi) *For each $z \in [\hat{n} - 1]$ and each triple $B \neq \{\alpha_i^j[z+1], \beta_i^j[z+1], \gamma_i^j[z]\}$ with $B \succeq_{\gamma_i^j[z]} \{\alpha_i^j[z+1], \beta_i^j[z+1], \gamma_i^j[z]\}$ it holds that $B \cap \{\alpha_i^j[z], \beta_i^j[z]\} \neq \emptyset$.*
- (vii) *For each $B \neq \{w_j^i, w_j^p, w_j^q\}$ with $B \succeq_{w_j^i} \{w_j^i, w_j^p, w_j^q\}$ we have $B \cap \{\alpha_j^i[\hat{n}], \beta_j^i[\hat{n}]\} \neq \emptyset$.*

Finally, we show the correctness, i.e., “ $I = (X, \mathcal{S})$ admits an exact cover if and only if the constructed instance admits a 3-stable matching” via the following lemmas. Lemma 6 shows the “only if” direction and Lemma 8 the other.

- **Lemma 6** (\star). *If $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathcal{S}$ is an exact cover of I , then the following 3-matching Π is stable.*
- For each $S_j \in \mathcal{K}$ with $S_j = \{i, p, q\}$ add $\{w_j^i, w_j^p, w_j^q\}$ to Π .
 - For each element $i \in X$ and each set $S_j \in \mathcal{S}$ with $i \in S_j$, call the agents in the associated star-gadget along with the tail agents $0, \dots, 11, h_j^i, f_j^i$, and g_j^i .
 - Add $H_j^i, \{5, 10, 11\}, \{1, 6, 8\}, \{2, 3, 7\}$, and $\{0, 4, 9\}$ to Π .
 - If $S_j \in \mathcal{K}$, then add all triples $\{\alpha_i^j[z], \beta_i^j[z], \gamma_i^j[z-1]\}$, $z \in [\hat{n}]$, to Π . Otherwise, add all triples $A_i^j[z]$, $z \in [\hat{n}]$, to Π .
 - For each element $i \in X$ let S_k, S_r be the two sets which contain i , but are not chosen in the exact cover \mathcal{K} . Add $\{u_i, u_i^k, u_i^r\}$ to Π .

The proof of the other direction is based on the following properties.

- **Lemma 7** (\star). *Let Π be a 3-stable matching of the constructed instance. For each element $i \in X$ and each set S_j with $S_j = \{i, p, q\}$, the following holds:*

- (i) $H_j^i \in \Pi$.
- (ii) Π contains either all triples $\{\alpha_i^j[z], \beta_i^j[z], \gamma_i^j[z]\}$ or all triples $\{\alpha_i^j[z], \beta_i^j[z], \gamma_i^j[z-1]\}$, $z \in [\hat{n}]$.

Now, we consider the “if” direction.

- **Lemma 8.** *If Π is a 3-stable matching, then the subcollection \mathcal{K} with $\mathcal{K} = \{S_j \in \mathcal{S} \mid \{\alpha_i^j[1], \beta_i^j[1], \gamma_i^j[0]\} \in \Pi \text{ for some } i \in S_j\}$ is an exact cover.*

Proof. First of all, for each two chosen $S_j, S_k \in \mathcal{K}$ we observe that it cannot happen that $S_j \cap S_k \neq \emptyset$ as otherwise $\{u_i, u_i^j, u_i^k\}$ is a blocking triple; recall that $\gamma_i^j[0] = u_i^j$ and $\gamma_i^k[0] = u_i^k$. It remains to show that \mathcal{K} covers each element at least once.

Now, for each element $i \in X$, let S_j, S_k, S_r denote the three sets that contain i . We claim that at least one of S_j, S_k, S_r belongs to \mathcal{K} because of the following. If $S_j \notin \mathcal{K}$, then by construction, it follows that $T = \{\alpha_i^j[1], \beta_i^j[1], \gamma_i^j[0]\} \notin \Pi$. By Lemma 7(ii), it follows that $A_i^j[1] \in \Pi$. Since T is the most-preferred triple of both $\alpha_i^j[1]$ and $\beta_i^j[1]$ (see Observation 5(v)), by stability, u_i^j must be matched in a triple which she weakly prefers to T . Since $A_i^j[1] \in \Pi$, it follows that either $\{u_i^j, u_i^k, u_i^r\} \in \Pi$ or $\{u_i^j, u_i, v\} \in \Pi$ for some $v \in \{u_i^k, u_i^r\}$. It cannot happen that $\{u_i^j, u_i^k, u_i^r\} \in \Pi$ as otherwise there will be at least three blocking triples, including $\{u_i, u_i^j, u_i^r\}$. Hence, $\{u_i^j, u_i, v\} \in \Pi$ for some $v \in \{u_i^k, u_i^r\}$. Without loss of generality, assume that $v = u_i^k$. Then, it is straightforward to check that $\{u_i^r, \alpha_i^r[1], \beta_i^r[1]\} \in \Pi$. This implies that $S_r \in \mathcal{K}$.

To complete the correctness proof, we show that for each element $p \in S_r \setminus \{i\}$ it holds that $\{\alpha_p^r[1], \beta_p^r[1], \gamma_p^r[0]\} \in \Pi$. Let $S_r = \{i, p, q\}$. Since $S_r \in \mathcal{K}$, by definition and by Lemma 7(ii), we infer that $\{\alpha_i^r[\hat{n}], \beta_i^r[\hat{n}], \gamma_i^r[\hat{n}-1]\} \in \Pi$ (for some constant \hat{n} defined in the construction). We infer that $\{w_r^i, w_r^p, w_r^q\} \in \Pi$ due to the following: By Lemma 7(i), we know that $H_r^i \in \Pi$; recall that $H_r^i = \{f_r^i, g_r^i, h_r^i\}$. Since both f_r^i and g_r^i prefer $\{f_r^i, g_r^i, w_r^i\}$ to H_r^i (see the first part of Observation 5(iii)), it follows by stability that $\Pi(w_r^i) \succeq_{w_r^i} \{f_r^i, g_r^i, w_r^i\}$. By Observation 5(vii), we infer that $\Pi(w_r^i) = \{w_r^i, w_r^p, w_r^q\}$ since $\alpha_p^r[\hat{n}]$ and $\beta_q^r[\hat{n}]$ are not available anymore. This means that $A_p^r[\hat{n}'] \in \Pi$ since $w_r^p = \gamma_p^r[\hat{n}']$ and $w_r^q = \gamma_q^r[\hat{n}']$ (for some constants \hat{n}' and \hat{n}''). Consequently, we infer by Lemma 7(ii) that $\{\alpha_p^r[1], \beta_p^r[1], \gamma_p^r[0]\} \in \Pi$, as desired. ◀

This concludes the proof of Theorem 1 for $d = 3$.

$W \setminus (\{0, 1\} \cup Y)$ it holds that $\delta(w, y) > \ell$. Points 0 and 1 are the two points from $W \setminus Y$ which are closest to the points in Y .

To specify the embedding, We first fix points 0, 1, and Y such that the distances between them are as stated above and they are embedded roughly around a straight line. Then, we fix the positions of X_0, X_1 , and the centroid of the pentagon to ensure the values a, b, b', c, c' , and ℓ satisfy the above relations. For each $i \in \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}$ and each two points $x \in X_i$ and $x' \in X_{i+1 \bmod 5}$, the angle α (resp. β) at the points $2i, x$, and x' (resp. $2i+1, x'$, and x) is less than 90 degrees. The angle at points y, j , and x ($y \in Y, \{i, j\} = \{0, 1\}, x \in X_i$) is more than 90 degrees. After fixing $X_0, X_1, 0$, and 1, we can determine the other points by simple calculations.

Now, we turn to odd d , i.e., $d = 2\kappa + 1$. Instead of having ten points $\{0, \dots, 9\}$, we create five points that form a star with the pentagon. Consider an instance with $7\kappa + 5$ agents called W where 5κ agents are embedded to replace the five vertices of a pentagon with κ agents at each vertex of the pentagon. That is, each vertex of the pentagon is a cluster of points. Note the five clusters of points by X_0, X_1, X_2, X_3 , and X_4 . There are five points $\{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}$ that form a star with the pentagon, as in Example 2 (see Figure 4 (right)). Point i is at a distance b from X_i and c from $X_{i+1 \bmod 5}$, for each $i \in \{0, \dots, 4\}$ where $a < b < c < \ell$ and $b < 2a$.

The remaining 2κ points are called Y . Together, $W := \bigcup_{i \in \{0, \dots, 4\}} X_i \cup \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\} \cup Y$.


All points in Y are embedded within an enclosing circle with radius close to zero. For each point y in Y , it holds that $b - \varepsilon \leq \delta(0, y) < b$, and for each point w in $W \setminus (\{0\} \cup Y)$ it holds that $\delta(y, w) > \ell$. Point 0 is the only point from $W \setminus Y$ which is closest to the points in Y . The remaining unmentioned points are at distance at least $b/2$ to the points Y . We specify the embeddings of the agents similarly to the one for even d .

Using a similar reasoning as to Example 2, we claim that the above embeddings are feasible.

Since the distance between each two points in X_i is close to zero, we assume it to be 0 for ease of reasoning. The following lemma summarizes the crucial effect of the star-gadget.

► **Lemma 10** (*). *Every d -stable matching Π of the instance in Example 9 satisfy that if d is even, then $\Pi(0) \cap Y \neq \emptyset$ or $\Pi(1) \cap Y \neq \emptyset$, and if d is odd, then $\Pi(0) = Y \cup \{0\}$.*

The remaining gadgets. Let $I = (X, \mathcal{S})$ be an instance of PC-X3C. Similarly to the case with $d = 3$, we first embed the associated graph $G(I) = (U \cup W, E)$ into a 2-dimensional grid with edges drawn using line segments of length at least $L \geq 200$, and with parallel lines at least $4L$ grid squares apart. The element- and the edge-gadget are almost the same as the ones describe in Subsection 3.1. The only difference is that we replace each element-agent u_i (for $u_i \in U$) with a size- $(d-2)$ coalition U_i that are embedded so close to each other that any stable matching must match them together. Similarly, for each $z \in [\hat{n}]$ (recall that \hat{n} is a constant as defined in the Subsection 3.1) and $w_j \in W$, we replace the two agents $\alpha_i^j[z]$ and $\beta_i^j[z]$ with a size- $(d-1)$ coalition $\hat{A}_i^j[z]$ such that the distance between each pair of points in $\hat{A}_i^j[z]$ is close to zero, and define $\hat{A}_i^j[z] := \hat{A}_i^j[z] \cup \{\gamma_i^j[z]\}$. For each set-vertex $w_j \in W$, assume that the three connecting edges in $G(I)$ are going rightward, leftward, and upward, connecting the element-vertices u_i, u_p, u_q , respectively. We create three set-agents, called w_j^i, w_j^p, w_j^q , and an additional coalition W_j of size $d-3$ and as before, define $w_j^i = \gamma_j^i[\hat{n}]$. We embed them into \mathbb{R}^2 in such a way that w_j^i, w_j^p, w_j^q are on the segment of the rightward, leftward, and upward edge, respectively, and are of equidistance 17.5 to each other, and the coalition W_j is embedded in the center so that the distance between any two of them is close



■ **Figure 5** Element and set gadgets described in Subsection 4.1.

to zero. Moreover, the largest distance from any agent of W_j to any agent of $\{w_j^i, w_j^p, w_j^q\}$ is 10. See Figure 5 for an illustration.

We remark that by the construction of the set-gadget and the edge-gadget, each set-agent w_j^i prefers coalition $A_i^j[\hat{n}]$ (recall that $\gamma_i^j[z] = w_j^i$) to coalition $\{w_j^i, w_j^p, w_j^q\} \cup W_j$ since the sum of distances from w_j^i to the latter coalition is $17.5 + 17.5 + 10(d-3) > (d-1) \cdot (10 - \varepsilon)$. To ensure that one of the two coalitions is chosen, we make use of the star-gadgets from Example 9. Define $b := 22.6$ and $c := 22.7$. We create an agent-subset F_j^i of size $d-1$ and agent h_j^i and a star-gadget W as described in Example 9, with Y being the extra $d-1$ agents such that the most preferred coalition of each agent in Y is $Y \cup \{h_j^i\}$. Note that F_j^i has the same role as $\{f_j^i, g_j^i\}$ in the case for $d = 3$.

- The distance between each two agents in F_j^i is close to zero.
- The distance from each agent in F_j^i to each agent in $\hat{A}_i^j[\hat{n}]$ is in the range of $[10 + \varepsilon, 10 + 2\varepsilon]$.
- The distance from each agent in F_j^i to agent w_j^i is $10 + \frac{15}{d-1}$.
- The distance from each agent in F_j^i to agent h_j^i is $15 + 2\varepsilon$.
- The distance from agent h_j^i and each agent Y is $15 + 3\varepsilon$.
- The distance from each agent Y to 0 (and also to 1 if d is even) is $15 + 4\varepsilon$.

Finally, we create two types of garbage collector agents to match with some left over agents. For each added star gadget corresponding to S_j and $i \in S_j$, we create $O(\kappa)$ garbage collector agents R_j^i as follows: If d is odd, set $|R_j^i| := d - \kappa - 2$. Otherwise if $d \leq 6$, set $|R_j^i| := 2d - \kappa - 5$, and otherwise set $|R_j^i| := d - \kappa - 5$. These agents have distance close to zero to each other. For each $y \in R_j^i$ it holds that $\ell < \delta(y, x) < 2\ell < \delta(y, x')$, where x is an agent from the same star and x' is an agent from neither R_j^i or the same star. It is straightforward to see that the distance between any two agents from different star-gadgets is larger than ℓ , and the distance from an agent in W to an agent to a set-gadget is at larger ℓ , where a, b, b', c' , and ℓ are as defined in Example 9. Lastly, we add $m - n$ triples of additional garbage collector agents. The agents in each triple have distance close to zero to each other but is far away from the other agents. Note that each triple will be matched to some W_j whenever S_j is not chosen to the exact cover. See Figure 6 (for even d , without the garbage collector agents) for an illustration. This completes the description of the construction, which clearly can be done in polynomial time.

4.2 The correctness proof for $d \geq 4$

The reasoning for the correctness is similar to the one for $d = 3$. For the forward direction, assume that (X, \mathcal{S}) admits an exact cover \mathcal{K} . Then, using a reasoning similar to the one for $d = 3$, one can verify that the following d -matching Π is stable; recall that $\kappa = \lfloor (d-1)/2 \rfloor$.




Figure 6 Gadget for edge $\{u_i, w_j\}$ in $G(I)$ with $S_j = \{i, p, q\}$ for the case when d is even, omitting the garbage collector agents for the sake of brevity.

- For each $S_j \in \mathcal{K}$ with $S_j = \{i, p, q\}$ add $\{w_j^i, w_j^p, w_j^q\} \cup W_j$ to Π .
- For each element $i \in X$ let S_k, S_r be the two sets which contain i , but are not chosen in the exact cover \mathcal{K} . Add $U_i \cup \{u_i^k, u_i^r\}$ to Π . For each $S_j \notin \mathcal{K}$, take a triple of garbage collector agents (of the second type) and match them with W_j .
- For each element $i \in X$ and each set $S_j \in \mathcal{S}$ with $i \in S_j$, call the agents in the associated star-gadget along with the tail $X_0 \cup \dots \cup X_4 \cup \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, h_j^i\} \cup Y \cup \{F_j^i\} \cup \{5, 6, 7, 8, 9 \mid \text{if } d \text{ odd}\}$. If $S_j \in \mathcal{K}$, then add all $\hat{A}_j^i[z] \cup \{\gamma_j^i[z-1]\}$, $z \in [\hat{n}]$, to Π . Otherwise, add all $A_j^i[z]$, $z \in [\hat{n}]$, to Π . Add $F_j^i \cup \{h_j^i\}$ and $Y \cup \{0\}$ to Π . If d is odd, add $X_1 \cup X_2 \cup \{1\}$ and $X_3 \cup X_4 \cup \{3\}$ to Π . Otherwise, add $X_1 \cup X_2 \cup \{2, 3\}$ and $X_3 \cup X_4 \cup \{6, 7\}$ to Π . Next, if $d \leq 6$, then match X_0 with $d - \kappa$ agents from $(1, 8, 9, 4)$ (in this sequence) to Π . In any case, match the remaining star-agents with R_j^i .

The proof for the backward direction works analogously to $d = 3$ and is deferred to the appendix.

5 Conclusion and Outlook

Establishing the first complexity results in the study of multi-dimensional stable matchings for Euclidean preferences, we show that d -SR remains NP-hard for Euclidean preferences and for all fixed $d \geq 3$. The gadgets in the reductions may be useful for other matching and hedonic games problems with Euclidean preferences.

Our Euclidean preference model assumes that the preferences over coalitions are based on the sum of distances to all individual agents in the coalition. It would be interesting to see whether taking the maximum or the minimum distance to the coalition members instead of the sum would change the complexity. Furthermore, it would be interesting to see whether restricting the agents' embedding to 1-dimensional Euclidean space could lower the complexity. We were not able to identify the complexity for this restricted variant, but conjecture that it can be solved in polynomial time. Note that in 1-dimensional Euclidean space, a 3-stable matching for the maximum distance setting always exists, which can be found by greedily finding three consecutive agents which are closest to each other and matching them.

References

- 1 Esther M Arkin, Sang Won Bae, Alon Efrat, Kazuya Okamoto, Joseph SB Mitchell, and Valentin Polishchuk. Geometric stable roommates. *Information Processing Letters*, 109(4):219–224, 2009.
- 2 Giuseppe Di Battista, Giuseppe Liotta, and Francesco Vargiu. Spirality and optimal orthogonal drawings. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 27(6):1764–1811, 1998.
- 3 Vittorio Bilò, Gianpiero Monaco, and Luca Moscardelli. Hedonic games with fixed-size coalitions. In *Proceedings of the 36th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI ’22)*, 2022. To appear.
- 4 Péter Biró and Eric McDermid. Three-sided stable matchings with cyclic preferences. *Algorithmica*, 58(1):5–18, 2010.
- 5 Robert Brederbeck, Jiehua Chen, Ugo P. Finnendahl, and Rolf Niedermeier. Stable roommate with narcissistic, single-peaked, and single-crossing preferences. *Autonomous Agents and Multi-Agent Systems*, 34(53):1–29, 2020.
- 6 Robert Brederbeck, Klaus Heeger, Dusan Knop, and Rolf Niedermeier. Multidimensional stable roommates with master list. In *Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on Web and Internet Economics (WINE ’20)*, volume 12495 of *LNCS*, pages 59–73, 2020.
- 7 Jiehua Chen, Gergely Csáji, Sanjukta Roy, and Sofia Simola. Cores in friend-oriented hedonic games: Verification is surprisingly harder than searching. Technical report, arXiv:2203.09655, 2022.
- 8 Ágnes Cseh, Tamás Fleiner, and Petra Harján. Pareto optimal coalitions of fixed size. *Journal of Mechanism and Institution Design*, 4(1):87–108, 2019.
- 9 Vladimir G. Deineko and Gerhard J. Woeginger. Two hardness results for core stability in hedonic coalition formation games. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 161(13-14):1837–1842, 2013.
- 10 Dinko Dimitrov, Peter Borm, Ruud Hendrickx, and Shao Chin Sung. Simple priorities and core stability in hedonic games. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 26:421–433, 2006.
- 11 Jacques H. Dréze and Joseph Greenberg. Hedonic coalitions: Optimality and stability. *Econometrica*, 48(4):98–1003, 1980.
- 12 Kimmo Eriksson, Jonas Sjöstrand, and Pontus Strimling. Three-dimensional stable matching with cyclic preferences. *Mathematical Social Sciences*, 52(1):77–87, 2006.
- 13 David Gale and Lloyd S. Shapley. College admissions and the stability of marriage. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 120(5):386–391, 1962.
- 14 Michael R. Garey and David S. Johnson. *Computers and Intractability: A Guide to the Theory of NP-Completeness*. W. H. Freeman, 1979.
- 15 Chien-Chung Huang. Two’s company, three’s a crowd: Stable family and threesome roommates problems. In *Proceedings of the 15th Annual European Symposium (ESA ’07)*, volume 4698 of *LNCS*, pages 558–569, 2007.
- 16 Robert W. Irving. An efficient algorithm for the ‘stable roommates’ problem. *Journal of Algorithms*, 6(4):577–595, 1985.
- 17 Kazuo Iwama, Shuichi Miyazaki, and Kazuya Okamoto. Stable roommates problem with triple rooms. In *Proceedings of the 10th KOREA-JAPAN joint workshop on algorithms and computation (WAAC ’07)*, pages 105–112, 2007.
- 18 Donald Ervin Knuth. *Mariages stables et leurs relations avec d’autres problèmes combinatoires: introduction à l’analyse mathématique des algorithmes*. Les Presses de l’Université de Montréal, 1976.
- 19 Chi-Kit Lam and C Gregory Plaxton. On the existence of three-dimensional stable matchings with cyclic preferences. In *Proceedings of the 12th International Symposium on Algorithmic Game Theory (SAGT ’19)*, volume 11801 of *LNCS*, pages 329–342, 2019.
- 20 David F. Manlove. *Algorithmics of Matching Under Preferences*, volume 2 of *Series on Theoretical Computer Science*. World Scientific, 2013.

- 21 Michael McKay and David F. Manlove. The three-dimensional stable roommates problem with additively separable preferences. In *Proceedings of the 14th International Symposium on Algorithmic Game Theory (SAGT '21)*, volume 12885 of *LNCS*, pages 266–280, 2021.
- 22 Cristopher Moore and J. M. Robson. Hard tiling problems with simple tiles. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 26(4):573–590, 2001.
- 23 Kazunori Ohta, Nathanaël Barrot, Anisse Ismaili, Yuko Sakurai, and Makoto Yokoo. Core stability in hedonic games among friends and enemies: Impact of neutrals. In *Proceedings of the 24th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI '17)*, pages 359–365, 2017.
- 24 Leslie G. Valiant. Universality considerations in VLSI circuits. *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, C-30(2):13–140, 1981.
- 25 Gerhard J. Woeginger. Core stability in hedonic coalition formation. In *Proceedings of the 39th Conference on Current Trends in Theory and Practice of Computer Science (SOFSEM '13)*, volume 7741 of *LNCS*, pages 33–50, 2013.
- 26 Mason Wright and Yevgeniy Vorobeychik. Mechanism design for team formation. In *Proceedings of the 29th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI '15)*, pages 1050–1056, 2015.

Appendix

A Additional Material for Subsection 3.1

A.1 Proof of Observation 5

Proof. Statements (i) follows from the fact that the distance between agents 10 and 11 is close to zero and agent h_j^i is the next nearest neighbor of them. Statement (ii) follows from the fact that the closest neighbors of h_j^i are f_j^i and g_j^i , followed by agents 10 and 11.

The first part of Statement (iii) is straightforward to verify after noticing that $\delta(x, y) < 10 + 2\varepsilon = \delta(x, h_j^i)$ for all $x \in \{f_j^i, g_j^i\}$ and $y \in \{\alpha_i^j[\hat{n}], \beta_i^j[\hat{n}], w_j^i\}$. To prove the second part of Statement (iii), assume that $B \succeq_x \{f_j^i, g_j^i, h_j^i\}$ with $B \neq \{f_j^i, g_j^i, h_j^i\}$. We first show that $\{f_j^i, g_j^i\} \subseteq B$. Notice that the distance between f_j^i and g_j^i is close to zero. Moreover, by construction, the next nearest neighbor of f_j^i (resp. g_j^i) is at distance at least $10 + \varepsilon$. Since $\delta(f_j^i, \{f_j^i, g_j^i, h_j^i\}) = \delta(g_j^i, \{f_j^i, g_j^i, h_j^i\}) = 10 + 2\varepsilon + \delta(f_j^i, g_j^i) < 2(10 + \varepsilon)$, any triple that is weakly preferred to $\{f_j^i, g_j^i, h_j^i\}$ by agent f_j^i (resp. g_j^i) must contain both f_j^i and g_j^i . Now it is straight-forward to verify that $B \cap \{\alpha_i^j[\hat{n}], \beta_i^j[\hat{n}], \gamma_i^j[\hat{n}]\} \neq \emptyset$ since $\alpha_i^j[\hat{n}], \beta_i^j[\hat{n}]$, and $\gamma_i^j[\hat{n}]$ are the only agents to which x has distance no more than $10 + 2\varepsilon$.

Statement (iv) follows directly from the fact that $\alpha_i^j[z]$ and $\beta_i^j[z]$ are the unique nearest neighbors of $\gamma_i^j[z]$. The reasoning for Statement (v) is similar to the one for Statement (i). The reasoning for Statement (vi) is similar to the one for Statement (ii).

To prove Statement (vii), we only need to observe that all agents in $\{\alpha_i^j[\hat{n}], \beta_i^j[\hat{n}]\}$ are the nearest neighbors of w_j^i , followed by the agents in $\{w_j^p, w_j^q\}$. ◀

A.2 Proof of Lemma 6

Proof. We prove this by showing that no agent can be involved in a blocking triple.

First, observe that if $S_j \in \mathcal{K}$ with $S_j = \{i, p, q\}$, then $T = \{w_j^i, w_j^p, w_j^q\} \in \Pi$ and hence no agent in T is involved in a blocking triple since for each $z \in S_j$ and each B with $B \succ_{w_j^z} T$, it holds by Observation 5(vii), that $B \cap \{\alpha_z^j[\hat{n}], \beta_z^j[\hat{n}]\} \neq \emptyset$, but both $\alpha_z^j[\hat{n}]$ and $\beta_z^j[\hat{n}]$ have been assigned to their most preferred triple, namely $\{\alpha_z^j[\hat{n}], \beta_z^j[\hat{n}], \gamma_z^j[\hat{n} - 1]\}$ (see Observation 5(v)) as defined above. If $S_j \notin \mathcal{K}$, to prove that w_j^i is not involved in a blocking triple, we later show that $\gamma_i^j[\hat{n}]$ (which is w_j^i) is not involved in a blocking triple.

We show that a blocking triple cannot contain any agent from $A_i^j[z]$ for all $z \in [\hat{n}]$, where \hat{n} is a constant as defined in the construction. We distinguish between two cases based on whether S_j is in \mathcal{K} ; again let $S_j = \{i, p, q\}$.

Case 1: $S_j \in \mathcal{K}$. Then, for each $z \in [\hat{n}]$, none of $\alpha_i^j[z]$ and $\beta_i^j[z]$ is involved in a blocking triple since both are matched to their most preferred triple (see Observation 5(v)). Therefore, $A_i^j[z]$ is not blocking. For all $z \in [\hat{n} - 1]$, agent $\gamma_i^j[z]$ is not in any blocking triple since every triple that is strictly preferred to $\Pi(\gamma_i^j[z])$ by $\gamma_i^j[z]$ also contains $\alpha_i^j[z]$ or $\beta_i^j[z]$ (see Observation 5(vi)) but none of the latter two is involved in a blocking triple; recall that we already showed that $\gamma_i^j[\hat{n}] = w_j^i$ is not involved in any blocking triple.

Case 2: $S_j \notin \mathcal{K}$. Then, for each $z \in [\hat{n}]$, agent $\gamma_i^j[z]$ is matched to its most preferred triple $A_i^j[z]$ and hence, not involved in a blocking triple. To show that neither $\alpha_i^j[z]$ nor $\beta_i^j[z]$ is involved in a blocking triple for each $z \in [\hat{n}]$, let us consider an arbitrary agent $x \in \{\alpha_i^j[z], \beta_i^j[z]\}$, $z \in [\hat{n}]$. By Observation 5(v), triple $\{\alpha_i^j[z], \beta_i^j[z], \gamma_i^j[z - 1]\}$ is the only triple which is preferred to $\Pi(x) = A_i^j[z]$ by agent x . However, $\gamma_i^j[z]$ does not prefer $\{\alpha_i^j[z], \beta_i^j[z], \gamma_i^j[z - 1]\}$ to her assigned triple since she is already matched to her

most preferred triple (recall that $\gamma_i^j[0] = u_i^j$ and by construction, agent $\Pi(u_i^j)$ is also the most preferred triple of u_i^j). This means that x cannot be involved in a blocking triple.

Further, for each element $i \in X$ with $i \in S_k, S_r$ and $S_k, S_r \notin \mathcal{K}$, the agents u_i^k, u_i^r are matched to their most preferred coalition and so is u_i and they do not form blocking.

It remains to show that no agent from $H_j^i \cup \{0, \dots, 11\}$ is involved in a blocking triple. Notice that agent h_j^i is matched to her most preferred triple H_j^i and hence, not involved in a blocking triple. Neither f_j^i nor g_j^i is involved in a blocking triple because of the following: All triples that are weakly preferred to $\Pi(f_j^i) = \Pi(g_j^i) = H_j^i$ by f_j^i or g_j^i contain f_j^i and g_j^i , and someone from $A_i^j[\hat{n}]$ (see the second part of Observation 5(iii)), but we just showed that no agent from $A_i^j[\hat{n}]$ is involved in a blocking triple.

From the construction and by Observation 5(i), both 10's and 11's most preferred triple is $\{10, 11, h_j^i\}$ followed by $\{5, 10, 11\} = \Pi(10) = \Pi(11)$. Since h_j^i is not in a blocking triple, $\{10, 11, h_j^i\}$ is not blocking. Thus, 10 and 11 are not involved in a blocking triple.

Finally, by construction, agents 5, 7, and 9 are not involved in a blocking triple since they are each matched to their most preferred triple, respectively. Neither is agent 2 involved in a blocking triple since she only prefers $\{1, 2, 3\}$ to her assigned triple $\{2, 3, 7\}$ but agent 3 does not prefer $\{1, 2, 3\}$ to her assigned triple $\{2, 3, 7\}$. Agent 3 cannot be involved in a blocking triple since the triple which she prefers to her assigned one involves either agent 2 or agent 4 but we just reasoned that neither 2 nor 4 is involved in a blocking triple. Similarly, we can infer that agent 4 is not involved in blocking triple: The triple which agent 4 prefers to her assigned one involves either 4 or 5 but we just reasoned that neither 4 nor 5 is involved in a blocking triple. Finally, none of $\{1, 6, 8\}$ is involved in a blocking triple since no other agent from the same star-gadget or from the element-gadget, set-gadget, or edge-gadget is involved in blocking triple and all agents not from the same star-gadget are further away. Summarizing, Π is stable. \blacktriangleleft

A.3 Proof of Lemma 7

Proof. In this proof, since i and j are fixed, we drop i and j from the superscripts and subscripts (except for w_i^j) for ease of notation. Further, let $0, \dots, 11$ denote the agents of the star-gadget associated to the set-agent w_j^i . We first prove the following two claims which will be used in the proof.

▷ **Claim 11.** Π contains $\{5, 10, 11\}$.

Now, to show the first statement, suppose, for the sake of contradiction, that $\Pi(h) \neq \{f, g, h\}$. Recall that $\{5, 10, 11\} \in \Pi$ (see Claim 11). Since $\{h, 10, 11\}$ is the most preferred triple for both agents 10 and 11 (see Observation 5(i)), by stability, $\Pi(h) \succeq_h \{h, 10, 11\}$. Then, by Observation 5(ii), $\Pi(h) \cap \{10, 11\} \neq \emptyset$, a contradiction to Π being a partition. This completes the proof.

The next claim states that there are exactly two possible matchings of the agents on the chain connecting the element- and set-gadget.

▷ **Claim 12.** For each $z \in [\hat{n}]$, if $A[z] \notin \Pi$, then $\{\alpha[z], \beta[z], \gamma[z-1]\} \in \Pi$.

Proof of Claim 12. Consider an arbitrary index $z \in [\hat{n}]$ and assume that $A[z] \notin \Pi$. Notice that, by Observation 5(iv), triple $A[z]$ is the unique most preferred triple of $\gamma[z]$; recall that $\gamma[\hat{n}] = w_j^i$. Hence, by our assumption, to prevent $A[z]$ from blocking Π , agent $\alpha[z]$ or agent $\beta[z]$ has to be matched in a triple that she weakly prefers to $A[z]$. By Observation 5(v), triple $\{\alpha[z], \beta[z], \gamma[z-1]\}$ is the only triple which is weakly preferred to $A[z]$ by $\alpha[z]$ or $\beta[z]$. Therefore, $\{\alpha[z], \beta[z], \gamma[z-1]\} \in \Pi$. \diamond

To show the lemma, we distinguish between two cases:

Case 1: $\{\alpha[\hat{n}], \beta[\hat{n}], \gamma[\hat{n} - 1]\} \in \Pi$. This means that $A[\hat{n} - 1] \notin \Pi$. By Claim 12, it follows that $\{\alpha[\hat{n} - 1], \beta[\hat{n} - 1], \gamma[\hat{n} - 2]\} \in \Pi$. By repeatedly using the above reasoning, we infer that $\{\alpha[z], \beta[z], \gamma[z - 1]\} \in \Pi$ for all $z \in [\hat{n}]$, as desired.

Case 2: $\{\alpha[\hat{n}], \beta[\hat{n}], \gamma[\hat{n} - 1]\} \notin \Pi$. Notice that $S := \{\alpha[\hat{n}], \beta[\hat{n}], \gamma[\hat{n} - 1]\}$ is the unique most preferred triple of both $\alpha[\hat{n}]$ and $\beta[\hat{n}]$ (see Observation 5(v)). By stability, we have that $\Pi(\gamma[\hat{n} - 1]) \succeq_{\gamma[\hat{n} - 1]} S$. By Observation 5(vi), we infer that $\Pi(\gamma[\hat{n} - 1]) \cap \{\alpha[\hat{n} - 1], \beta[\hat{n} - 1]\} \neq \emptyset$. This implies that $\{\alpha[\hat{n} - 1], \beta[\hat{n} - 1], \gamma[\hat{n} - 2]\} \notin \Pi$, and by the contra-positive of Claim 12 we have that $A[\hat{n} - 1] \in \Pi$. By repeatedly using the above reasoning, we infer that $A[z] \in \Pi$ for all $z \in [\hat{n} - 1]$. It remains to show that $A[\hat{n}] \in \Pi$. This is straightforward to see since $A[\hat{n} - 1] \in \Pi$, meaning that $\gamma[\hat{n} - 1]$ is not available anymore: By Observation 5(iv)–(v), we infer that $A[\hat{n}] \in \Pi$ is the unique most preferred triple of each agent in $A[\hat{n}]$. Hence, $A[\hat{n}] \in \Pi$.

This completes the proof of Lemma 7. \blacktriangleleft

B Additional Material for Subsection 4.1

B.1 Proof of Lemma 10

Proof. The case when d is even. Suppose, towards a contradiction, that $\Pi(0) \cap Y = \emptyset$ and $\Pi(1) \cap Y = \emptyset$. To improve readability, in the following, the subscript $i + 1$ in X_{i+1} is taken modulo 5. Then, the most preferred available coalition for 0 and 1 is $X_0 \cup X_1 \cup \{0, 1\}$. Furthermore, for each $i \in \{0, \dots, 4\}$, the distance between the points $2i$ and $2i + 1$, $i \in \{1, \dots, 4\}$, is close to zero, and the next closest points to $2i$ (resp. $2i + 1$) are those from X_{i+1} , followed by those from X_i . Hence, for each $i \in \{0, \dots, 4\}$, the most preferred available coalition of $2i$ (resp. $2i + 1$) is $\{2i, 2i + 1\} \cup X_{i+1} \cup X_i$. We will use this observation in the proof whenever we consider potential blocking coalitions containing $2i$ and $2i + 1$.

First, we show that there exists an index $i \in \{0, \dots, 4\}$ such that $X_i \cup X_{i+} \subseteq \Pi(x)$ for some $x \in X_i$. That is at least one “pentagon edge” is matched together.

We begin with the following simple claim.

\triangleright **Claim 13.** For each $i \in \{0, \dots, 4\}$ it holds that if $X_i \not\subseteq \Pi(x_i)$ for some $x_i \in X_i$, then $\delta(x_i, \Pi(x_i)) \geq (\kappa + 3)a$ for each $x_i \in X_i$.

Proof of Claim 13. If $X_i \not\subseteq \Pi(x_i)$, then $|\Pi(x_i) \cap X_i| \leq \kappa - 1$ since $|X_i| = \kappa$. Then at least $\kappa + 3$ points in $\Pi(x_i)$ are not in X_i . Hence, $\delta(x_i, \Pi(x_i)) \geq (\kappa + 3)a$. \diamond

Whenever $X_i \subseteq \Pi(x_i)$ for some $x_i \in X_i$, we abuse the notation to write the matching coalition containing X_i as $\Pi(X_i)$ for $i \in \{0, \dots, 4\}$.

Towards a contradiction, suppose that for each $i \in \{0, \dots, 4\}$, there exists a point $x \in X_i$ such that $X_i \cup X_{i+1} \not\subseteq \Pi(x)$. Without loss of generality, we consider $i = 3$ and two cases based on how X_3 is matched. We will show contradiction in both cases, thereby implying $X_i \cup X_{i+1} \subseteq \Pi(x)$ for some $x \in X_i$ for some $i \in \{0, \dots, 4\}$.

Case 1: $X_3 \not\subseteq \Pi(x_3)$ for some $x_3 \in X_3$. Then from Claim 13, $\delta(x_3, \Pi(x_3)) \geq (\kappa + 3)a$. Then, we observe the following.

- (i) In order for $X_2 \cup X_3 \cup \{4, 5\}$ to not be blocking, $\delta(x_2, \Pi(x_2)) \leq \kappa a + c + c'$. Recall that $c + c' < 3a$. By the contra-positive of Claim 13, we have that $X_2 \subseteq \Pi(x_2)$ for some $x_2 \in X_2$.

(ii) In order for $X_3 \cup X_4 \cup \{6, 7\}$ to not be blocking,

$$\delta(x_4, \Pi(x_4)) \leq \kappa a + b + b'. \quad (1)$$

Recall that $b + b' < 3a$. By the contra-positive of Claim 13, $X_4 \subseteq \Pi(x_4)$ for some $x_4 \in X_4$.

Since $\delta(x_4, \Pi(x_4)) \leq \kappa a + b + b'$ (see (1)), and since by assumption not all points in X_3 can be matched together with X_4 , it follows that $X_0 \cap \Pi(X_4) \neq \emptyset$.

Recall that by our assumption, for all $i \in \{0, \dots, 4\}$, it holds that $X_i \cup X_{i+1} \not\subseteq \Pi(x)$ holds for some $x \in X_i$. Therefore, $X_0 \not\subseteq \Pi(X_4)$. Then,

for each $x_0 \in X_0 \cap \Pi(X_4)$, it holds that $\delta(x_0, \Pi(x_0)) \geq \kappa a + b + \ell$ and

for each $x_0 \notin X_0 \cap \Pi(X_4)$, it holds that $\delta(x_0, \Pi(x_0)) \geq (\kappa + 3)a$.

This implies that for all $x_0 \in X_0$, we have that $\delta(x_0, \Pi(x_0)) > \kappa a + c + c'$. Hence, for $X_0 \cup X_1 \cup \{0, 1\}$ to not be blocking, there must exist a point $x_1 \in X_1$ with $\delta(x_1, \Pi(x_1)) \leq \kappa a + b + b' < (\kappa + 3)a$; recall that $\max(b + b', c + c') < 3a$. Let $x_1 \in X_1$ denote such a point, i.e., $\delta(x_1, \Pi(x_1)) \leq \kappa a + b + b'$. Then, by the contra-positive of Claim 13, we have that $X_1 \subseteq \Pi(x_1)$. Since not all points in X_0 can be matched with X_1 and $\delta(x_1, \Pi(x_1)) \leq \kappa a + b + b'$, we have that $X_2 \cap \Pi(X_1) \neq \emptyset$. Recall that $X_2 \subseteq \Pi(X_2)$. This implies that X_1 and X_2 are matched together, a contradiction.

Case 2: $X_3 \subseteq \Pi(x_3)$ for some $x_3 \in X_3$. We distinguish two cases based on how X_4 is matched.

Case 2.1: $X_4 \subseteq \Pi(x_4)$ for some $x_4 \in X_4$, then no point in X_4 is matched with X_3 and at most $\kappa - 1$ points from X_0 is matched with X_4 . This implies that $\delta(x_4, \Pi(x_4)) \geq (\kappa - 1)a + b + b' + c > \delta(x_3, \{6, 7\} \cup X_3 \cup X_4)$ for all $x_4 \in X_4$. Furthermore, at most $\kappa - 1$ points from X_2 can be matched with X_3 , implying that $\delta(x_3, \Pi(x_3)) \geq (\kappa - 1)a + b + b' + c > \delta(x_3, \{6, 7\} \cup X_4 \cup X_3)$ for all $x_3 \in X_3$. This results in $X_3 \cup X_4 \cup \{6, 7\}$ blocking Π .

Case 2.2: If $X_4 \not\subseteq \Pi(x_4)$ for some $x_4 \in X_4$, then $\delta(x_4, \Pi(x_4)) \geq (\kappa + 3)a + c + c'$ by Claim 13. This case is symmetric to Case 1 by replacing X_3 with X_4 as shown next.

In order for $X_0 \cup X_4 \cup \{8, 9\}$ to not be blocking Π , there must exist an $x_0 \in X_0$ with $\delta(x_0, \Pi(x_0)) \leq \kappa a + b + b' < (\kappa + 3)a$ since $b + b' < 3a$. By Claim 14, we have that $X_0 \subseteq \Pi(x_0)$. By assumption that no pentagon edge is matched with each other, we further infer that $\Pi(X_0) \cap X_1 \neq \emptyset$.

But since no “pentagon edge” is matched, it follows that $X_1 \not\subseteq \Pi(X_0)$. Therefore, by Claim 13, we have that $\delta(x_1, \Pi(x_1)) \geq (\kappa + 3)a$ for each $x_1 \in X_1$. Then, in order for coalition $X_1 \cup X_2 \cup \{2, 3\}$ to not be blocking, there must exist a point $x_2 \in X_2$ with $\delta(x_2, \Pi(x_2)) \leq \delta(x_2, X_1 \cup X_2 \cup \{2, 3\}) = \kappa a + b + b' < (\kappa + 3)a$. Therefore, by Claim 14, it follows that $X_2 \subseteq \Pi(x_2)$ for each $x_2 \in X_2$ and $\Pi(X_2) \cap X_3 \neq \emptyset$ since X_2 cannot be matched with all κ points in X_1 . Recall that we assumed in this case that $X_3 \subseteq \Pi(x_3)$ for some $x_3 \in X_3$. Then $X_2 \cup X_3$ are matched together, contradicting our assumption that no “pentagon edge” is matched together.

Hence, we proved that $X_i \cup X_{i+1}$ are matched together for some $i \in \{0, \dots, 4\}$. Without loss of generality, let $X_3 \cup X_4 \cup \{u, v\} \in \Pi$. As in the proof of Lemma 3, for each possible value of u and v we will show a contradiction to stability of Π , by showing that no agents u and v exist which are matched with $X_3 \cup X_4$ in a d-stable matching. We distinguish between several cases.

Case 1: $\{u, v\} \not\subseteq X_0 \cup X_2 \cup \{4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9\}$. Then, $X_3 \cup X_4 \cup \{6, 7\}$ is blocking.

Case 2: $u \notin X_0 \cup X_2 \cup \{4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9\}$ and $v \in X_0 \cup X_2 \cup \{4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9\}$.

Case 2.1: $v \in X_0$. For each $x_3 \in X_3$, it holds that $\delta(x_3, \Pi(x_3)) \geq \kappa a + \ell + \ell > \kappa a + c + c'$. The first inequality follows because $u \notin X_0 \cup X_2 \cup \{4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9\}$. The second inequality follows from the fact that $\ell > \max(c, c')$. Again, since $u \notin X_0 \cup X_2 \cup \{4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9\}$, for each $x_4 \in X_4$ it holds that $\delta(x_4, \Pi(x_4)) \geq \kappa a + a + \ell > \kappa a + b + b'$; recall that $a + \ell > b + b'$. Hence, $X_3 \cup X_4 \cup \{6, 7\}$ is blocking.

Case 2.2: $v \in X_2$. Recall that $u \notin X_0 \cup X_2 \cup \{4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9\}$. For each $x_3 \in X_3$, it holds that $\delta(x_3, \Pi(x_3)) \geq \kappa a + a + \ell > \kappa a + b + b'$. In order for $X_2 \cup X_3 \cup \{4, 5\}$ to not block, by the contra-positive of Claim 13, we have that $X_2 \subseteq \Pi(x_2)$ for all $x_2 \in X_2$. This is a contradiction to $v \in X_2$ and $u \notin X_2$.

Case 2.3: $v \in \{4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9\}$, then $X_3 \cup X_4 \cup \{6, 7\}$ is blocking since $u \notin \{6, 7\}$.

Case 3: $u \in X_0 \cup X_2 \cup \{4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9\}$ and $v \notin X_0 \cup X_2 \cup \{4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9\}$. This case is symmetric to Case 2.

Case 4: $\{u, v\} \subseteq X_0 \cup X_2 \cup \{4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9\}$.

Case 4.1: $v \in X_2$. Then, for each $x_4 \in X_4$ it follows that $\delta(x_4, \Pi(x_4)) \geq \kappa a + a + \ell > \kappa a + c + c'$. In order for $X_4 \cup X_0 \cup \{8, 9\}$ to not block, by the contra-positive of Claim 13, it follows that $X_0 \subseteq \Pi(x_0)$ for all $x_0 \in X_0$. This implies that $X_0 \cap \Pi(X_4) = \emptyset$ since $X_3 \subseteq \Pi(X_4)$. Hence, again, for $X_4 \cup X_0 \cup \{8, 9\}$ to not block, it must hold that $\Pi(X_0) = X_0 \cup X_1 \cup \{8, 9\}$. Then, for each $x_1 \in X_1$ it holds that $\delta(x_1, \Pi(x_1)) \geq \kappa a + \ell + \ell > \kappa a + c + c'$. Furthermore, since not all points in X_2 are matched together (since $v \in X_2$), by Claim 13, for each $x_2 \in X_2$ it holds that $\delta(x_2, \Pi(x_2)) \geq (\kappa + 3)a > \kappa a + b + b'$. This implies that $X_2 \cup X_1 \cup \{2, 3\}$ is blocking.

Case 4.2: $v \notin X_2, u \in \{4, 5\}$. Then, for each $x_4 \in X_4$, it holds that $\delta(x_4, \Pi(x_4)) \geq \kappa a + a + \ell' > \kappa a + b + b'$, where $\ell' = \delta(5, x_4) > \ell$. The second inequality follows from the fact $a + \ell' > b + b'$. In order for $X_0 \cup X_4 \cup \{8, 9\}$ to not block, by Lemma 10, for each $x_0 \in X_0$ it holds that $X_0 \subseteq \Pi(x_0)$ such that $\delta(x_0, \Pi(x_0)) \leq \kappa a + b + b'$. In particular, it also implies that $X_0 \cap \Pi(X_4) = \emptyset$. By the distance bound, it means that $\Pi(X_0) = X_0 \cup X_1 \cup \{8, 9\}$. Hence, for each agent $x_2 \in X_2$ it holds that $\delta(x_2, \Pi(x_2)) \geq \kappa a + c + c'$. This implies that $X_2 \cup X_1 \cup \{2, 3\}$ is blocking.

Case 4.3: $v \notin X_2, u \in \{6, 7, 8, 9\}$. Then, for each $x_3 \in X_3$ it holds that $\delta(x_3, \Pi(x_3)) \geq \kappa a + c + b > \kappa a + b + b'$. In order for $X_2 \cup X_3 \cup \{4, 5\}$ to not be blocking, by Claim 13, for each $x_2 \in X_2$ it holds that $X_2 \subseteq \Pi(x_2)$ such that $\delta(x_2, \Pi(x_2)) \leq \kappa a + c + c'$. Moreover, it must hold that $X_1 \subseteq \Pi(X_2)$. Hence, for each $x_1 \in X_1$ it holds that $\delta(x_1, \Pi(x_1)) \geq \kappa a + c + c'$. In order for $X_0 \cup X_1 \cup \{0, 1\}$ to not block, by Claim 13, for each $x_0 \in X_0$ it holds that $X_0 \subseteq \Pi(x_0)$ such that $\delta(x_0, \Pi(x_0)) \leq \kappa a + c + c'$. This implies that at least κ agents from $X_1 \cup X_4$ must be matched with X_0 , a contradiction.

Case 4.5: $v \notin X_2, u \in X_0$. This case is symmetric to Case 2.1.

Therefore, in each case we get a contradiction showing that no agents u and v exist which can be matched with $X_3 \cup X_4$ in a \mathbf{d} -stable matching. Hence, no \mathbf{d} -stable matching exists for which $\Pi(0) \cap Y = \emptyset$ and $\Pi(1) \cap Y = \emptyset$.

The case when \mathbf{d} is odd. Suppose, towards a contradiction, that $\Pi(0) \neq Y \cup \{0\}$. Then, we infer that $\Pi(0) \cap Y = \emptyset$ since otherwise $Y \cup \{0\}$ is blocking due to the following: By construction, $Y \cup \{0\}$ is the unique most preferred coalition of agent 0. Moreover, by assumption, at most $\mathbf{d} - 2$ points from Y are matched together; recall that $|Y| = \mathbf{d} - 1$. Then, $\delta(y', \Pi(y')) \geq 2(b/2) > b - \varepsilon$ for each $y' \in Y$; recall that all remaining points are at distance at least $b/2$ to Y . Hence, $Y \cup \{0\}$ is blocking.

To improve readability, in the following, the subscript $i + 1$ in X_{i+1} is taken modulo 5. Then the most preferred coalition for 0 which does not intersect Y is $X_0 \cup X_1 \cup \{0\}$. The proof will be similar to the proof of Lemma 10. First, we show that there exists $i \in \{0, \dots, 4\}$ such that $X_i \cup X_{i+1} \subseteq \Pi(x)$ for some $x \in X_i$. That is at least one “pentagon edge” is matched together. Similar to the case for d being even, we begin with a simple observation

▷ **Claim 14.** For each $i \in \{0, \dots, 4\}$ it holds that if $X_i \not\subseteq \Pi(x_i)$ for some $x_i \in X_i$, then $\delta(x_i, \Pi(x_i)) \geq (\kappa + 2)a$ for each $x_i \in X_i$.

Proof of Claim 14. If $X_i \not\subseteq \Pi(x_i)$, then $|\Pi(x_i) \cap X_i| \leq \kappa - 1$ since $|X_i| = \kappa$. Then at least $\kappa + 2$ points in $\Pi(x_i)$ are not in X_i . Hence, $\delta(x_i, \Pi(x_i)) \geq (\kappa + 2)a$. ◊

Whenever $X_i \subseteq \Pi(x_i)$ for some $x_i \in X_i$, we abuse the notation to write the matching coalition containing X_i as $\Pi(X_i)$ for $i \in \{0, \dots, 4\}$. Towards contradiction to our claim that at least one pentagon edge is matched, suppose that for each $i \in \{0, \dots, 4\}$, there exists a point $x \in X_i$ such that $X_i \cup X_{i+1} \not\subseteq \Pi(x)$. Without loss of generality, we consider two cases based on how X_3 is matched. We will show contradiction in both cases, thereby implying $X_i \cup X_{i+1 \bmod 5} \subseteq \Pi(x)$ for some $x \in X_i$ for some $i \in \{0, \dots, 4\}$.

Case 1: $X_3 \not\subseteq \Pi(x_3)$ for some $x_3 \in X_3$. Then by Claim 14, $\delta(x_3, \Pi(x_3)) \geq (\kappa + 2)a > \kappa a + c$. In order for $X_3 \cup X_4 \cup \{3\}$ and $X_3 \cup X_2 \cup \{2\}$ to not block, respectively, by Claim 14, it must hold that $X_4 \subseteq \Pi(x_4)$ and $\delta(x_4, \Pi(x_4)) \leq \kappa a + b$ for all $x_4 \in X_4$, and $X_2 \subseteq \Pi(x_2)$ and $\delta(x_2, \Pi(x_2)) \leq \kappa a + c$ for all $x_2 \in X_2$. In other words, at least κ agents from $X_3 \cup X_0$ have to be matched with X_4 and at least κ agents from $X_3 \cup X_1$ have to be matched with X_2 . Since $X_3 \not\subseteq \Pi(x_3)$ for some $x_3 \in X_3$, it follows that $X_0 \cap \Pi(X_4) \neq \emptyset$ and $X_1 \cap \Pi(X_2) \neq \emptyset$. We distinguish between two cases.

If $X_0 \subseteq \Pi(x_0)$ for some $x_0 \in X_0$, then $X_0 \subseteq \Pi(X_4)$. By the distance bound for the agents in X_4 , it follows that the last agent in $\Pi(X_4) \setminus (X_4 \cup X_0)$ is either 3 or some agent from X_3 .

In both cases, it follows that $\delta(x_0, \Pi(x_0)) \geq \kappa a + \ell > \kappa a + c$. In order for $X_0 \cup X_1 \cup \{0\}$ to not block (recall that $0 \cup Y \notin \Pi$), by Claim 14, it follows that $X_1 \subseteq \Pi(x_1)$ so that $\delta(x_1, \Pi(x_1)) \leq \kappa a + b$ for all $x_1 \in X_1$. Since no agent in X_0 is matched to X_1 , we have that $\Pi(x_1) = X_2 \cup X_1 \cup \{0\}$. This implies that $X_2 \cup X_3 \cup \{2\}$ is blocking since $X_3 \not\subseteq \Pi(x_3)$ for some $x_3 \in X_3$.

Case 2: $X_3 \subseteq \Pi(x_3)$ for some $x_3 \in X_3$, i.e., all points in X_3 are matched together. Since no pentagon edge is matched among each other, meaning that $X_2 \not\subseteq \Pi(X_3)$.

Case 2.1: If $X_4 \subseteq \Pi(x_4)$ for some $x_4 \in X_4$, then no point in X_4 is matched with X_3 and at most $\kappa - 1$ points from X_0 is matched with X_4 ; recall that we assume that no pentagon edge is matched to each other. This implies that $\delta(x_4, \Pi(x_4)) \geq (\kappa - 1)a + b + c > \delta(x_3, \{3\} \cup X_3 \cup X_4)$ for all $x_4 \in X_4$. Furthermore, at most $\kappa - 1$ points from X_2 can be matched with X_3 , implying that $\delta(x_3, \Pi(x_3)) \geq (\kappa - 1)a + b + c > \delta(x_3, \{3\} \cup X_4 \cup X_3)$ for all $x_3 \in X_3$. This results in $X_3 \cup X_4 \cup \{3\}$ blocking Π .

Case 2.2: If $X_4 \not\subseteq \Pi(x_4)$ for some $x_4 \in X_4$, then $\delta(x_4, \Pi(x_4)) \geq (\kappa + 2)a > \kappa a + c$ by Claim 14. This case is symmetric to Case 1 by replacing X_3 with X_4 as shown next.

In order for $X_0 \cup X_4 \cup \{4\}$ to not block Π , there must exist an $x_0 \in X_0$ with $\delta(x_0, \Pi(x_0)) \leq \kappa a + b < (\kappa + 2)a$ since $b < 2a$. By Claim 14, we have that $X_0 \subseteq \Pi(x_0)$. By assumption, we further infer that $\Pi(X_0) \cap X_1 \neq \emptyset$.

But since no “pentagon edge” is matched, it follows that $X_1 \not\subseteq \Pi(X_0)$. Therefore, by Claim 14, we have that $\delta(x_1, \Pi(x_1)) \geq (\kappa + 2)a$ for each $x_1 \in X_1$. Then, in order for coalition $X_1 \cup X_2 \cup \{1\}$ to not be blocking, there must exist a point $x_2 \in X_2$ with

$\delta(x_2, \Pi(x_2)) \leq \delta(x_2, X_1 \cup X_2 \cup \{1\}) = \kappa a + b < (\kappa + 2)a$. Therefore, by Claim 14, it follows that $X_2 \subseteq \Pi(x_2)$ for each $x_2 \in X_2$, and $\Pi(X_2) \cap X_3 \neq \emptyset$ since not every point in X_1 can be matched to all points in X_2 . Recall that we assumed in this case that $X_3 \subseteq \Pi(x_3)$ for some $x_3 \in X_3$. Then $X_2 \cup X_3$ are matched together, contradicting the assumption that no “pentagon edge” is matched together.

Hence, we proved that $X_i \cup X_{i+1}$ are matched together for some $i \in \{0, \dots, 4\}$. Without loss of generality, let $X_3 \cup X_4 \cup \{u\} \in \Pi$. As in the proof of Lemma 3, for each possible value of u we will show a contradiction to stability of Π , showing that no agent u exists which is matched with $X_3 \cup X_4$ in a stable matching.

- Case 1:** $u \notin X_0 \cup X_2 \cup \{2, 3\}$. Then, $X_3 \cup X_4 \cup \{3\}$ is blocking.
- Case 2:** $u \in X_0 \cup \{3\}$. Then, $\delta(x_3, \Pi(x_3)) \geq \kappa a + c > \kappa a + b$ for each $x_3 \in X_3$. In order for $X_2 \cup X_3 \cup \{2\}$ to not be blocking, by Claim 14, it follows that $X_2 \subseteq \Pi(x_2)$ such that $\delta(x_2, \Pi(x_2)) \leq \kappa a + c$ for all $x_2 \in X_2$. In particular, this means that X_2 and X_1 are matched together such that $2 \in \Pi(X_2)$ or $1 \in \Pi(X_2)$. In any case, $\delta(x_1, \Pi(x_1)) \geq \kappa a + c > \kappa a + b$ for all $x_1 \in X_1$. In order for $X_0 \cup X_1 \cup \{0\}$ to not be blocking (recall that $\Pi(0) \cap Y = \emptyset$), by Claim 14, it follows that $\delta(x_0, \Pi(x_0)) \leq \kappa a + c$ for all $x_0 \in X_0$, implying that at least κ points from $X_4 \cup X_1$ have to be matched with X_0 . However, this is impossible since $X_3 \cup X_4 \subseteq \Pi(X_4)$ and $X_1 \cup X_2 \subseteq \Pi(X_1)$.
- Case 3:** $u \in X_2 \cup \{2\}$. Then, $\delta(x_4, \Pi(x_4)) \geq \kappa a + d > \kappa a + c$ for each $x_4 \in X_4$. In order for $X_0 \cup X_4 \cup \{4\}$ to not be blocking, by Claim 14, it follows that $X_0 \subseteq \Pi(x_0)$ such that $\delta(x_0, \Pi(x_0)) \leq \kappa a + b$ for all $x_0 \in X_0$. This implies that $\Pi(X_0) = X_0 \cup X_1 \cup \{4\}$. Consequently, we have that $\delta(x_1, \Pi(x_1)) > \kappa a + \ell > \kappa a + c$ for all $x_1 \in X_1$. In order for $X_1 \cup X_2 \cup \{1\}$ to not be blocking, by Claim 14, it follows that $\delta(x_2, \Pi(x_2)) \leq \kappa a + b$ for all $x_2 \in X_2$. However, this is impossible since $X_3 \cup X_4 \subseteq \Pi(X_3)$ and $X_1 \cup X_0 \subseteq \Pi(X_1)$.

Therefore, in each of case we get a contradiction showing that no agent u exists which is matched with $X_3 \cup X_4$ in a stable matching. Hence, no d -stable matching exists that does not contain $Y \cup \{0\}$. ◀

C Additional Material for Subsection 4.2

C.1 Remaining proof of the correctness of Theorem 1 for $d \geq 4$

We continue with the proof of Theorem 1 on page 14:

For the “if” direction, similar to Lemma 6, we show that the Π we defined is stable by showing no agent is in a blocking coalition.

For each element $i \in X$ let S_k, S_r be the two sets that contain i , but are not chosen into the exact cover. Then, both u_i^k and u_i^r are matched to their most preferred coalition and do not form blocking. The same holds for U_i .

Consider an arbitrary set S_j and let $i \in S_j$. A similar argument to Lemma 6 show that no agent from $A_i^j[z]$ is in a blocking coalition for each $z \in [\hat{n}]$.

Next, we show that W_j is not involved in any blocking coalition. Clearly, if $S_j \in \mathcal{K}$, then each agent W_j is matched with its most preferred coalition and will not be blocking. If $S_j \notin \mathcal{K}$, then the agents W_j cannot form a blocking coalition with other agent in the set-gadget or the chain on the grid. We show that the agents W_j cannot form a blocking coalition with any star-gadget or its tail since by showing that no agent on a star-gadget or its tail is blocking later.

Let us now consider the star-gadget and its tail corresponding to set S_j and element i with $i \in S_j$. We only show the case when d is even; the other case is similar. No agent in $\{0, 2, 3, 6, 7, h_j^i\}$ is involved in a blocking coalition since each of them is matched to its most preferred coalition. Further, no agent x in X_2 is involved in a blocking coalition since all coalitions T that x prefers to $\Pi(x)$ consist of X_2 and $\kappa + 2$ agents from $X_1 \cup X_3$ but no agent from $T \cap X_3$ will deviate. Similarly, no agent in X_4 is involved in a blocking coalition. Hence, no agent x in X_1 is involved in a blocking coalition since all coalitions that it prefers to $\Pi(x)$ involves at least one agent from $\{0, 2, 3\} \cup X_2$. Similarly, one can verify that no agent in $X_0 \cup \{8, 9, 1, 4, 5\}$ is involved in a blocking coalition.

Therefore, no coalition in the star-gadget is blocking.

Next we claim that no agent from $Y \cup F_j^i$ is in a blocking coalition. Y cannot be blocking since the only coalition preferred by Y to $\Pi(Y)$ is $Y \cup \{h_j^i\}$. Similarly, no agent f in F_j^i is involved in a blocking coalition, since the coalition that f prefers to $\Pi(f)$ involves some agent from $A_i^j[\hat{n}]$ but none of them is going to deviate. Hence, Π is stable.

Next we prove the “only if” direction of the correctness proof.

Assume that Π is a d -stable matching. We first prove a statement analogous to Lemma 7.

► **Lemma 15.** *For each element $i \in X$ and each set S_j with $S_j = \{i, p, q\}$ the stable matching Π satisfies the following.*

- (i) $F_j^i \subseteq \Pi(h_j^i)$.
- (ii) Π contains either all coalitions $A_i^j[z]$ or all coalitions $A_i^j[z] \setminus \{\gamma_i^j[z]\} \cup \{\gamma_i^j[z-1]\}$, $z \in [\hat{n}]$.

Proof. The reasoning for odd d is analogous to the case with $d = 3$; see the proof of Lemma 7. Hence, we assume that d is even with $d = 2\kappa + 2$. We drop i and j from the superscripts to improve readability. Furthermore, let Y denote the extra agents from the star-gadget, X_i , $i \in \{0, \dots, 4\}$ denote the “pentagon-agents”, and $0, \dots, 9$ denote the remaining agents in the gadget. First, by Lemma 10, we observe that there exists one agent $x \in \{0, 1\}$ with $\Pi(x) \cap Y \neq \emptyset$.

Then, for each $y \in (Y \cap \Pi(0)) \cup (Y \cap \Pi(1))$, we have that $\delta(y, \Pi(y)) \geq b - \varepsilon > \delta(y, \{h\} \cup Y)$. For each $y \in Y \setminus (\Pi(0) \cup \Pi(1))$, we have that $\delta(y, \Pi(y)) > \delta(y, h) + \delta(y, 0) > \delta(y, \{h\} \cup Y)$ (note that besides the agents in Y , agent h is the closest agent available to y , followed by 0). In order to prevent $Y \cup \{h\}$ from forming a blocking coalition, it must hold that $\delta(h, \Pi(h)) \leq \delta(h, Y)$. By construction, this implies that $\Pi(h) \cap F \neq \emptyset$.

Now, we show the first statement. Suppose, for the sake of contradiction, that $F \not\subseteq \Pi(h)$. This means that for each $f \in F \cap \Pi(h)$ it holds $\delta(f, \Pi(f)) \geq 15 + 2\varepsilon + 10 + \varepsilon > \delta(f, F \cup \{h\})$. Further, for each $f \in F \setminus \Pi(h)$ it holds that $\delta(f, \Pi(f)) \geq 2(10 + \varepsilon) > \delta(f, F \cup \{h\})$. We infer that $F \cup \{h\}$ is blocking since $F \cup \{h\}$ is the unique most preferred coalition of h , a contradiction.

Next, we claim the following:

► **Claim 16.** For each $z \in [\hat{n}]$, if $A[z] \notin \Pi$, then $\hat{A}[z] \cup \{\gamma[z-1]\} \in \Pi$.

Proof of Claim 16. The proof is similar to the one for Claim 12. Consider an arbitrary index $z \in [\hat{n}]$ and assume that $A[z] \notin \Pi$. Notice that, by construction, coalition $A[z]$ is the unique most preferred coalition of $\gamma[z]$; recall that $\gamma[\hat{n}] = w_j^i$. Then, to prevent $A[z]$ from blocking Π , at least one agent from $\hat{A}[z]$ has to be matched in a coalition that she weakly prefers to $A[z]$. Again, by construction, since coalition $\hat{A}[z] \cup \{\gamma[z-1]\}$ is the only coalition which is weakly preferred to $A[z]$ by a for some $a \in \hat{A}[z]$. Therefore, $\hat{A}[z] \cup \{\gamma[z-1]\} \in \Pi$. ◊

Using a reasoning similar to the one for Lemma 7, by the first statement and Claim 16, we can obtain the second statement in the lemma. We prove here for the sake of completeness.

Case 1: $\hat{A}[\hat{n}] \cup \{\gamma[\hat{n} - 1]\} \in \Pi$. This means that $A[\hat{n} - 1] \notin \Pi$. By Claim 16, it follows that $\hat{A}[\hat{n} - 1] \cup \{\gamma[\hat{n} - 2]\} \in \Pi$. By repeatedly using the above reasoning, we infer that $\hat{A}[z] \cup \{\gamma[z - 1]\} \in \Pi$ for all $z \in [\hat{n}]$, as desired.

Case 2: $\hat{A}[\hat{n}] \cup \{\gamma[\hat{n} - 1]\} \notin \Pi$. Notice that $\hat{A}[\hat{n}] \cup \{\gamma[\hat{n} - 1]\}$ is the unique most preferred coalition of each agent in $\hat{A}[\hat{n}]$. To prevent $\hat{A}[\hat{n}] \cup \{\gamma[\hat{n} - 1]\}$ from blocking, $\gamma[\hat{n} - 1]$ has to weakly prefer $\Pi(\gamma[\hat{n} - 1])$ to $\hat{A}[\hat{n}] \cup \{\gamma[\hat{n} - 1]\}$. By construction, $\Pi(\gamma[\hat{n} - 1])$ has to contain at least one agent from $\hat{A}[\hat{n} - 1]$, implying that $\hat{A}[\hat{n} - 1] \cup \{\gamma[\hat{n} - 2]\} \notin \Pi$. By the contra-positive of Claim 16, we infer that $A[\hat{n} - 1] \in \Pi$. By repeatedly using the above reasoning, we infer that $A[z] \in \Pi$ for all $z \in [\hat{n} - 1]$. It remains to show that $A[\hat{n}] \in \Pi$. Since $A[\hat{n} - 1] \in \Pi$ meaning that $\gamma[\hat{n} - 1]$ is not available, by construction, we infer that $A[\hat{n}]$ is the unique more preferred coalition of each agent in $A[\hat{n}]$, and hence by stability that $A[\hat{n}] \in \Pi$.

This completes the proof of the second statement. \blacktriangleleft

Finally, we show that the subcollection \mathcal{K} with $\mathcal{K} = \{S_j \in \mathcal{S} \mid \hat{A}_i^j[1] \cup \{\gamma_i^j[0]\} \in \Pi \text{ for some } i \in S_j\}$ is an exact cover. First, we claim that \mathcal{K} does not cover an element more than once. For each two chosen $S_j, S_k \in \mathcal{K}$ we observe that it cannot happen that $S_j \cap S_k \neq \emptyset$ as otherwise $\{u_i^j, u_i^k\} \cup U_i$ is a blocking coalition; recall that $\gamma_i^j[0] = u_i^j$ and $\gamma_i^k[0] = u_i^k$.

Second, we claim that \mathcal{K} is a cover. For each element $i \in X$, let S_j, S_k, S_r denote the three sets that contain i . We claim that at least one of S_j, S_k, S_r belongs to \mathcal{K} because of the following. If $S_j \notin \mathcal{K}$, then by construction, it follows that $T = \hat{A}_i^j[1] \cup \{\gamma_i^j[0]\} \notin \Pi$. By Lemma 15(ii), it follows that $A_i^j[1] \in \Pi$. Since by construction T is the only most-preferred coalition for each agent of $\hat{A}_i^j[1]$, by stability, u_i^j must be matched in a coalition which she weakly prefers to T ; recall that $u_i^j = \gamma_i^j[0]$. Since $A_i^j[1] \in \Pi$, this means that $\{u_i^j, v\} \cup U_i \in \Pi$ for some agent v . It cannot happen that $v \notin \{u_i^k, u_i^r\}$ as otherwise by construction there will be at least three blocking coalitions, including $U_i \cup \{u_i^j, u_i^r\}$. Hence, $\{u_i^j, v\} \cup U_i \in \Pi$ for some $v \in \{u_i^k, u_i^r\}$. Without loss of generality, assume that $v = u_i^k$. Then, it is straightforward to check that $\{u_i^r\} \cup \hat{A}_i^r[1] \in \Pi$ since $\{u_i^r\} \cup \hat{A}_i^r[1] \in \Pi$ is the unique most preferred coalition of each agent in $\hat{A}_i^r[1]$. This implies that $S_r \in \mathcal{K}$.

Finally, we show that $\hat{A}_p^r[1] \cup \{\gamma_p^r[0]\} \in \Pi$ for all $p \in S_r$. Suppose, for the sake of contradiction, that $\hat{A}_p^r[1] \cup \{\gamma_p^r[0]\} \notin \Pi$ for some $p \in S_r$. By Lemma 15(ii), we infer that $A_p^r[\hat{n}] \in \Pi$, and that $w_r^p = \gamma_p^r[\hat{n}]$ is not available for w_r^p (for some constant \hat{n}). Thus, $\{w_r^p\} \cup F_r^p$ forms a blocking coalition: By Lemma 15(i), each agent in F_r^p prefers $F_r^p \cup \{w_r^p\}$ to its assigned coalition $F_r^p \cup \{h_r^p\}$. Agent w_r^p also prefers $F_r^p \cup \{w_r^p\}$ to its assigned coalition since $\delta(w_r^p, \Pi(w_r^p)) \geq 17.5 + (d-3) \cdot 10 + 20 \geq (10 + \frac{15}{d-1}) \cdot (d-1) = \delta(w_r^p, F_r^p)$ (besides $W_r \cup \{w_r^q\}$ the next available agent is of distance at least 20 to w_r^p). Together we infer that \mathcal{K} is indeed an exact cover. This concludes the proof for all $d \geq 4$ and the proof for Theorem 1.