

# Stable matching: An integer programming approach\*

Chao Huang<sup>†</sup>

February 8, 2021

## Abstract

This paper develops an integer programming approach on two-sided many-to-one matching by investigating stable integral matchings of a fictitious continuum market induced from the original matching market. Each stable integral matching of the continuum market corresponds to a stable matching of the original matching market. We show that a stable matching exists in the original matching market when firms' preference profile satisfies a unimodularity condition. Our result indicates that a stable matching is guaranteed to exist with various forms of complementary preferences.

*Keywords:* two-sided matching; stability; integer programming; many-to-one matching; complementarity; unimodularity

*JEL classification:* C78, D47, D63

---

\*I am grateful to Ning Sun, Qianfeng Tang and Guoqiang Tian for their continuous support and encouragement.

<sup>†</sup>Institute for Social and Economic Research, Nanjing Audit University. Email: huangchao916@163.com

# 1 Introduction

The studies on matching markets originated from the seminar work of [Gale and Shapley \(1962\)](#) on the markets of marriage and college admission. During the past decades, the theory of two-sided matching has provided practical solutions to real-life matching problems such as hospital-doctor matching, college admission, and school choice.<sup>1</sup> In all these markets, substitutability is a critical condition that guarantees the existence of a stable matching. Complementary preferences have been regarded as the primary source of difficulties for market design. For instance, in a matching market with two firms  $f_1, f_2$ , and two workers  $w_1, w_2$ , the agents have the following preferences.

$$\begin{aligned}
 f_1 : \{w_1, w_2\} \succ \emptyset & & w_1 : f_1 \succ f_2 \\
 f_2 : \{w_1\} \succ \{w_2\} \succ \emptyset & & w_2 : f_2 \succ f_1
 \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

The preference of firm  $f_1$  exhibits complementarity in the sense that the firm wants to hire one worker only when the other can also be hired. No stable matching exists in this market.<sup>2</sup> However, consider the following market where the preference of  $f_2$  is changed.

$$\begin{aligned}
 f_1 : \{w_1, w_2\} \succ \emptyset & & w_1 : f_1 \succ f_2 \\
 f_2 : \{w_1, w_2\} \succ \{w_1\} \succ \{w_2\} \succ \emptyset & & w_2 : f_2 \succ f_1
 \end{aligned} \tag{1.2}$$

There exists a stable matching in this market where  $w_1$  and  $w_2$  are both hired by  $f_2$ . The complementary preference of  $f_1$  does not jeopardize stability in this market. This paper shows that the firms' preference profile in the latter example satisfies a unimodularity condition that guarantees a stable matching for all possible preferences of workers, while this condition is violated in the former example. We find that the concept of demand type proposed by [Baldwin and Klemperer \(2019\)](#) (henceforth, BK) in the context of general

---

<sup>1</sup>See [Roth and Peranson \(1999\)](#), [Roth \(2002\)](#), [Abdulkadiroğlu and Sönmez \(2003\)](#), and [Abdulkadiroğlu, Pathak and Roth \(2009\)](#), among others.

<sup>2</sup>In this market,  $f_1$  should hire both workers or neither of them in any stable matching. In the former case,  $f_2$  would form a blocking coalition with  $w_2$ , who prefers  $f_2$  to  $f_1$ . In the latter case,  $f_2$  would be matched with  $w_1$ , leaving  $w_2$  unmatched. Then  $f_1$  would form a blocking coalition with both  $w_1$  and  $w_2$ .

equilibria with indivisible goods is also useful to analyze firms' preferences in matching markets.<sup>3</sup> When the available set of workers expands,  $f_1$  would hire both workers when they are available. Thus  $f_1$  is of demand type  $\{(1, 1)\}$ . When the available set of workers for  $f_2$  expands from  $\{w_2\}$  to  $\{w_1, w_2\}$ ,  $f_2$  would drop  $w_2$  and hire  $w_1$  in the former example, thus the demand type of  $f_2$  contains  $(1, -1)$ , while the demand type of  $f_2$  does not contain  $(1, -1)$  in the latter example. The demand type of  $f_2$  is  $\{(1, 0), (0, 1)(1, -1)\}$  in the former example, and  $\{(1, 1), (1, 0), (0, 1)\}$  in the latter example.<sup>4</sup> Therefore, the demand type of firms is  $\{(1, 1), (1, 0), (0, 1)(1, -1)\}$  in the former example, which is not unimodular (because the determinant of  $(1, 1)$  and  $(1, -1)$  is  $-2$ ).<sup>5</sup> The demand type of firms is  $\{(1, 1), (1, 0), (0, 1)\}$  in the latter example, which is unimodular (because any matrix formed by two of these vectors has determinant 0 or  $\pm 1$ ). In this paper, we show that this unimodularity of firms' preferences guarantees the existence of a stable matching for all possible preferences of workers.

Previous studies on matching markets are mostly based on the Gale-Shapley mechanism or Taski's fixed point theorem.<sup>6</sup> This paper develops a new integer programming approach. We prove our result by studying the stable integral matchings of a continuum market of [Che, Kim, and Kojima \(2019\)](#) (henceforth, CKK) induced from the original matching market. We construct a fictitious continuum market of CKK, where there is a divisible mass of each worker and a particular continuous preference on worker shares for each firm. CKK's existence theorem guarantees the existence of a stable matching in

---

<sup>3</sup>BK's framework subsumes the problem of two-sided matching with continuous monetary transfers and quasi-linear utilities ([Kelso and Crawford, 1982](#)), see Section 6.4 of BK. In this paper, "matching market" refers to the problem of two-sided matching without monetary transfers ([Gale and Shapley, 1962](#), [Roth and Sotomayor, 1990](#)).

<sup>4</sup>In both examples, when the available set of workers for  $f_2$  expands from  $\emptyset$  to  $\{w_1\}$  or  $\{w_2\}$ ,  $f_2$  would hire  $w_1$  or  $w_2$ . Thus  $(1, 0)$  and  $(0, 1)$  are in  $f_2$ 's demand type in both examples. In the latter example, the demand type of  $f_2$  also contains  $(1, 1)$ , since when the available set of workers expands from  $\emptyset$  to  $\{w_1, w_2\}$ ,  $f_2$  would hire both workers.

<sup>5</sup>See Definition 4 for the formal definition of firms' demand type, which contains the demand type of the null firm.

<sup>6</sup>The Gale-Shapley mechanism with its variants is a standard tool for matching markets. For Taski's fixed point method, see [Adachi \(2000\)](#), [Fleiner \(2003\)](#), [Echenique and Oviedo \(2004\)](#), and [Echenique and Oviedo \(2006\)](#), among others.

this continuum market. Each stable integral matching of this market corresponds to a stable matching of the original matching market. Finally, the tools from integer programming can be applied to prove the existence of a stable integral matching in the continuum market when the demand type of firms is unimodular. In matching markets, unimodularity is a condition independent of substitutability and compatible with various forms of complementarities.<sup>7</sup> Therefore, our result indicates that a stable matching is guaranteed to exist with various forms of complementary preferences.

## 1.1 Related literature

The condition of substitutability has been recognized as crucial for the existence of stable outcomes. When firms have quasilinear utilities and continuous monetary transfers with workers, [Kelso and Crawford \(1982\)](#) found that the gross substitutes condition guarantees the existence of a stable matching. This setting is closely related to the problem of general equilibria with indivisible goods.<sup>8</sup> In matching markets, a stable matching also exists when workers are substitutes for firms ([Roth and Sotomayor, 1990](#)). In general equilibria with indivisible goods and matching markets, [Sun and Yang \(2006, 2009\)](#) and [Ostrovsky \(2008\)](#) respectively generalized this restriction to allow complementarities between two group of objects or agents, where substitutability is satisfied within each group. The market with such preference structures can be transformed into a market with substitutable preferences and guarantees a stable outcome.

This paper is closely related to [Che, Kim, and Kojima \(2019\)](#), with the concept of demand type of [Baldwin and Klemperer \(2019\)](#) playing a critical role. CKK found that when there is a continuum of workers in the market, a stable matching exists when firms have continuous preferences, which allow for various forms of complementarities. CKK proved their existence result by Brouwer (or Kakutani) fixed point theorem. Thus the ex-

---

<sup>7</sup>In general equilibria with indivisible goods, substitutability implies unimodularity (see Section 3.2 of BK). However, in matching markets, the two conditions are independent of each other, see Section 4.

<sup>8</sup>See [Gul and Stacchetti \(1999\)](#) and [Sun and Yang \(2006\)](#).

istence of a stable matching proved in this paper is essentially the existence of an integral Brouwer fixed point, which is very different from previous methods in matching theory.

BK proposed the concept of demand type in general equilibria with indivisible goods. Their Unimodularity Theorem shows that an equilibrium exists for all concave valuations of a demand type if and only if the demand type is unimodular. Their unimodularity condition accommodates more complementary preferences than substitutable preferences. They also provided conditions on whether an equilibrium exists for any specific valuations. BK proved their results by tools from tropical geometry. [Danilov, Koshevoy, and Murota \(2001\)](#) obtained the “if” part of the Unimodularity Theorem in discrete convex analysis.<sup>9</sup> [Tran and Yu \(2019\)](#) showed that the Unimodularity Theorem could also be proved via integer programming.

Complementarities were also considered in the problem of matching with couples (e.g., [Klaus and Klijn, 2005](#) and [Nguyen and Vohra, 2018](#)) and matching with peer effects (see [Echenique and Yenmez, 2007](#) and [Pycia, 2012](#)). CKK is a part of the literature that treated the problem of complementarity by looking for approximate stable outcomes, see [Azevedo, Weyl, and White \(2013\)](#), [Kojima, Pathak, and Roth \(2013\)](#), and [Azevedo and Hatfield \(2018\)](#), among others. A possible future direction is to study the stable integral matchings of the many-to-many market of [Azevedo and Hatfield \(2018\)](#). They assumed a continuum of agents on both sides and found that complementary preferences are allowed to appear on one side of the market. Our result can also be extended to the framework of matching with contract terms of [Hatfield and Milgrom \(2005\)](#) by studying the stable integral matchings of the market in Section S.9 of CKK.<sup>10</sup>

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the matching market, the continuum market induced from the matching market, and the concept of stable pseudo-matchings. Section 3 provides an illustrative example. Section 4 presents the result. Section 5 concludes. Proofs are relegated into the Appendix.

---

<sup>9</sup>The proof was provided in [Danilov and Koshevoy \(2004\)](#) as a special case of Theorem 3 therein.

<sup>10</sup>Contract terms between firms and workers may specify wages, insurances, retirement plans, etc. CKK extended their results to the framework of matching with contract terms in Section S.9 therein.

## 2 Matching market

### 2.1 Model

There is a set  $F = \{f_1, \dots, f_m\}$  of  $m$  firms, and a set  $W = \{w_1, \dots, w_n\}$  of  $n$  workers. Let  $\emptyset$  be the null firm, representing not being matched with any firm. Each worker  $w \in W$  has a strict, transitive and complete preference  $P_w$  over  $\tilde{F} := F \cup \{\emptyset\}$ . For any  $f, f' \in \tilde{F}$ , we write  $f \succ_w f'$  when  $w$  prefers  $f$  to  $f'$  according to  $P_w$ . We write  $f \succeq_w f'$  if either  $f \succ_w f'$  or  $f = f'$ . Let  $P_W$  denote the preference profile of all workers. Each firm  $f \in F$  has a strict, transitive and complete preference  $P_f$  over  $2^W$ . For any  $S, S' \subseteq W$ , we write  $S \succ_f S'$  when  $f$  prefers  $S$  to  $S'$  according to  $P_f$ . We write  $S \succeq_f S'$  if either  $S \succ_f S'$  or  $S = S'$ . Let  $P_F$  be the preference profile of all firms. A matching market can be summarized as a tuple  $\Gamma = (W, F, P_W, P_F)$ .

Let  $Ch_f$  be the choice function of  $f$  such that for any  $S \subseteq W$ ,  $Ch_f(S) \subseteq S$  and  $Ch_f(S) \succeq_f S'$  for any  $S' \subseteq S$ . By convention, let  $Ch_\emptyset(S) = S$  for all  $S \subseteq W$ . For any  $f \in F$ ,  $w \in W$  and  $S \subseteq W$ , we say  $f$  is acceptable to  $w$  if  $f \succ_w \emptyset$ ; we say  $S$  is acceptable to  $f$  if  $S \succ_f \emptyset$ .<sup>11</sup>

**Definition 1.** A **matching**  $\mu$  is a function from the set  $\tilde{F} \cup W$  into  $\tilde{F} \cup 2^W$  such that for all  $f \in \tilde{F}$  and  $w \in W$ ,

1.  $\mu(w) \in \tilde{F}$ ;
2.  $\mu(f) \in 2^W$ ;
3.  $\mu(w) = f$  if and only if  $w \in \mu(f)$ .

We say a matching  $\mu$  is **individual rational** if  $\mu(w) \succeq_w \emptyset$  for all  $w \in W$  and  $\mu(f) = Ch_f(\mu(f))$  for all  $f \in F$ . We say a firm  $f$  and a subset of workers  $S \subseteq W$  form a **blocking coalition** that blocks  $\mu$  if  $f \succeq_w \mu(w)$  for all  $w \in S$ , and  $S \succ_f \mu(f)$ . In words, individual

---

<sup>11</sup>Note that  $\emptyset$  is the null firm, while  $\emptyset$  is the empty set of workers.

rationality requires that each matched worker prefer her current employer to being unmatched and that no firm wish to unilaterally drop any of its employees.  $f$  and  $S$  blocks  $\mu$  if  $f$  strictly prefers  $S$  to its current set of employees  $\mu(f)$ , and each worker  $w$  in  $S$  weakly prefers  $f$  to her current employer  $\mu(w)$ .

**Definition 2.** A matching  $\mu$  is **stable** if it is individual rational and there is no blocking coalition that blocks  $\mu$ .<sup>12</sup>

A stable matching is guaranteed to exist in a matching market when the preference of each firm satisfies the following condition.

**Definition 3.** Firm  $f$  has **substitutable** preference if for any  $S \subseteq W$  and any  $\{w, w'\} \subseteq S$ , if  $w \in Ch_f(S)$ , then  $w \in Ch_f(S \setminus \{w'\})$ .

If, on the contrary, there exist  $S \subseteq W$  and  $\{w, w'\} \subseteq S$  such that  $w \in Ch_f(S)$  but  $w \notin Ch_f(S \setminus \{w'\})$ , then we would naturally consider that there is a complementary effect between  $w$  and  $w'$ , because  $w$  is desired only when  $w'$  is also available.

Now we introduce the concept of demand type of BK to matching markets. We represent a subset  $S \subseteq W = \{w_1, \dots, w_n\}$  of workers by an  $n$ -dimensional 0-1 vector  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \{0, 1\}^n$ , denoted  $vector(S) = \mathbf{x}$ , where  $x_i = 1$  if  $w_i \in S$  and  $x_i = 0$  if  $w_i \notin S$  for all  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . For any  $S, S' \subseteq W$  such that  $vector(S) = \mathbf{x}$  and  $vector(S') = \mathbf{x}'$ , we abuse the notation to write  $\mathbf{x} \succeq_f \mathbf{x}'$  when  $S \succeq_f S'$ ;  $\mathbf{x} \succ_f \mathbf{x}'$  when  $S \succ_f S'$ ; and  $Ch_f(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}'$  when  $Ch_f(S) = S'$ .

**Definition 4.** For each  $f \in F$ , let  $\mathcal{D}_f$  be the set of vectors such that  $d \in \mathcal{D}_f$  if  $d$  is nonzero and  $d = vector(Ch_f(S)) - vector(Ch_f(S \setminus S'))$  for some nonempty  $S, S'$  such that  $S' \subset S \subseteq W$ . We call  $\mathcal{D}_f$  the **demand type** of firm  $f$ . Let the demand type of the null firm  $\emptyset$  be the set of  $n$ -dimensional unit vectors  $\mathcal{D}_\emptyset = \{\mathbf{e}^1, \mathbf{e}^2, \dots, \mathbf{e}^n\}$ .<sup>13</sup> The preference profile of firms is of demand type  $\mathcal{D} = \cup_{f \in \tilde{F}} \mathcal{D}_f$ .

<sup>12</sup>The no blocking coalition condition implies the individual rationalities of firms:  $\mu(f) = Ch_f(\mu(f))$  for all  $f \in F$ . This is also the case for Definition 6 (see footnote 28 of CKK). The exposition of these two definitions follows the convention in the literature.

<sup>13</sup>The definition of the demand type of the null firm is different from that of the firms in  $F$ . If we define the demand type of the null firm as that of the firms in  $F$ ,  $\mathcal{D}_\emptyset$  would contain all nonnegative 0-1 vectors.

**Example 1.** Suppose there are two firms  $F = \{f_1, f_2\}$  and two workers  $W = \{w_1, w_2\}$ , where firms have the following preferences.

$$f_1 : \{w_1, w_2\} \succ \emptyset \qquad f_2 : \{w_1, w_2\} \succ \{w_2\} \succ \emptyset$$

Then  $\mathcal{D}_{f_1} = \{(1, 1)\}$ ,  $\mathcal{D}_{f_2} = \{(1, 1), (1, 0), (0, 1)\}$ , and  $\mathcal{D}_\emptyset = \{(1, 0), (0, 1)\}$ . The preference profile of firms is of demand type  $\mathcal{D} = \{(1, 1), (1, 0), (0, 1)\}$ . Neither of the firms has substitutable preference, since for both firms  $w_1$  is desired only when  $w_2$  is also available.

The definition of unimodularity for a set of integral vectors is as follows.<sup>14</sup>

**Definition 5.** A set of vectors in  $\mathbb{Z}^n$  is **unimodular** if every linearly independent subset can be extended to a basis for  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , of integer vectors, with determinant  $\pm 1$ .

The “determinant” of  $n$  vectors in  $\mathbb{Z}^n$  is the determinant of the  $n \times n$  matrix which has them as its columns. We say  $k < n$  linearly independent vectors  $\mathbf{a}^1, \dots, \mathbf{a}^k$  can be extended to a basis for  $\mathbb{R}^n$  if there exist vectors  $\mathbf{a}^{k+1}, \dots, \mathbf{a}^n$  such that  $\mathbf{a}^1, \dots, \mathbf{a}^n$  is a basis of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Given a set of vectors in  $\mathbb{Z}^n$ , if its maximally linearly independent subset contains  $n$  vectors, then unimodularity simply requires the determinant of every maximally linearly independent subset to be  $\pm 1$ . This is true for the demand type of firms  $\mathcal{D}$  in Example 1. See Fact B.7 of BK (following Lemma I.2 of [Cassels, 1971](#)) on how to check the unimodularity of a set of  $k < n$  linearly independent vectors in  $\mathbb{Z}^n$ .

## 2.2 A continuum market

Now we construct a continuum market of CKK from a matching market  $\Gamma$  by assuming that each worker in  $W = \{w_1, \dots, w_n\}$  is divisible. In this setting  $W$  is called the set of worker types. There is a divisible mass of quantity 1 of each worker type  $w \in W$ . A vector  $\mathbf{x} \in [0, 1]^n$  is called a **subpopulation** where  $x_i$  is the quantity of the type- $w_i$

---

<sup>14</sup>The unimodular matrix defined in integer programming (see Section 21.4 of [Schrijver, 1986](#)) is a matrix where the set of vectors of its columns is unimodular.



workers for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . Let  $x(w)$  denote the quantity of type- $w$  workers for any subpopulation  $\mathbf{x} \in [0, 1]^n$  and any  $w \in W$ , that is,  $x(w) = x_i$  if  $w = w_i$ . Given a subpopulation  $\mathbf{x} \in [0, 1]^n$ , let  $integral(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{y} \in \{0, 1\}^n$  where  $y_i = 0$  if  $x_i = 0$  and  $y_i = 1$  if  $x_i > 0$  for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . We say a subset of worker types  $S \subseteq W$  (or  $\mathbf{z} \in \{0, 1\}^n$ ) is **available** at subpopulation  $\mathbf{x} \in [0, 1]^n$ , if  $w_i \in S$  implies  $x_i > 0$  (or  $z_i = 1$  implies  $x_i > 0$ ). We also write  $workers(\mathbf{x}) = S \subseteq W$  where  $w_i \in S$  if  $x_i > 0$ . Each worker type  $w \in W$  has a strict preference  $P_w$  over  $\tilde{F}$ , where  $P_w$  is the preference of worker  $w$  in the original market  $\Gamma$ . Each firm  $f \in \tilde{F}$  has a choice function  $\widehat{Ch}_f : [0, 1]^n \rightarrow [0, 1]^n$ , where  $\widehat{Ch}_f(\mathbf{x}) \leq \mathbf{x}$ . By convention, let  $\widehat{Ch}_\emptyset(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in [0, 1]^n$ . We now construct a choice function  $\widehat{Ch}_f$  for each firm  $f \in F$ , based on its preference  $P_f$  in  $\Gamma$ .

Let  $\mathbf{u}^1 \succ_f \mathbf{u}^2 \succ_f \dots \succ_f \mathbf{u}^L \succ_f \mathbf{0}$  be the preference order of firm  $f$  over its acceptable sets of workers in  $\Gamma$ , where  $\mathbf{u}^j \in \{0, 1\}^n$  for all  $j \in \{1, \dots, L\}$  and  $\mathbf{0}$  is the empty set of workers. Before proceeding to the formal definition of  $\widehat{Ch}_f$ , we want to give an intuitive description of this choice function, which resembles that of the Probabilistic Serial assignment of [Bogomolnaia and Moulin \(2001\)](#). Consider the workers of each worker type of  $\mathbf{x}$  as a divisible dessert. The firm first consumes the workers of each type of  $\mathbf{u}^j$  from  $\mathbf{x}$  simultaneously, at speed 1, where  $j$  is the smallest index such that  $\mathbf{u}^j$  is available at  $\mathbf{x}$ . When the workers of one worker type of  $\mathbf{u}^j$  is eaten up, the firm switches to consume the workers of  $\mathbf{u}^{j'}$  simultaneously, at speed 1, where  $j'$  is the smallest index such that  $\mathbf{u}^{j'}$  is available at the remaining subpopulation. This procedure goes on until the time reaches 1, or until there is no acceptable set of worker types available at the remaining subpopulation.

**Example 2.** Suppose  $f$  has the preference:  $\{w_1, w_2\} \succ \{w_2, w_3\} \succ \{w_3\} \succ \emptyset$  in  $\Gamma$ , then  $\widehat{Ch}_f((0.6, 0.6, 0.5)) = (0.6, 0.6, 0.4)$ : It first consumes 0.6 of each of the type- $w_1$  and type- $w_2$  workers. Then since  $\{w_2, w_3\}$  is not available at the remaining subpopulation  $(0, 0, 0.5)$ , it switches to consume 0.4 of the type- $w_3$  workers when the time reaches 1. For another case,  $\widehat{Ch}_f((0.1, 0.4, 0.1)) = (0.1, 0.2, 0.1)$ : The firm first consumes 0.1 of each of the type- $w_1$  and type- $w_2$  workers, then it consumes 0.1 of each of the type- $w_2$  and type- $w_3$  workers from the the remaining subpopulation  $(0, 0.3, 0.1)$ . The procedure then terminates since there is

no acceptable set of worker types available at the remaining subpopulation (0,0,2,0).

Formally, for any  $\mathbf{x} \in [0, 1]^n$ ,  $\widehat{Ch}_f(\mathbf{x})$  is defined by the following recursive procedure. Let  $t_0 = 0$ ,  $\mathbf{z}^0 = \mathbf{x}$ . Suppose  $t_0, \mathbf{z}^0, \dots, t_{k-1}, \mathbf{z}^{k-1}$  ( $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, L\}$ ) are already defined, then define

$$t_k = \min\left\{1 - \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} t_j, z_i^{k-1} \mid i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\} \text{ and } u_i^k \neq 0\right\} \quad (2.1)$$

$$\mathbf{z}^k = \mathbf{z}^{k-1} - t_k \mathbf{u}^k$$

After the sequences  $(t_k)_{k=0}^L$  and  $(\mathbf{z}^k)_{k=0}^L$  have been defined, we define

$$\widehat{Ch}_f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{k=1}^L t_k \mathbf{u}^k \quad (2.2)$$

When we consider this procedure as the consuming process described above, for each  $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, L\}$ ,  $t_k$  is the time the firm spends in consuming  $\mathbf{u}^k$ .  $\mathbf{z}^k$  is the remaining subpopulation after  $\mathbf{u}^k$  has been consumed. If  $\sum_{j=1}^{k'} t_j = 1$  for some  $k' \in \{1, 2, \dots, L-1\}$ , then  $t_{k''} = 0$  for all  $k'' \in \{k'+1, \dots, L\}$ . It turns out that the choice function  $\widehat{Ch}_f$  constructed above is continuous and satisfies the revealed preference property.

**Lemma 1.**  *$\widehat{Ch}_f$  is continuous and satisfies the revealed preference property: for any  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in [0, 1]^n$  with  $\mathbf{x}' \leq \mathbf{x}$ ,  $\widehat{Ch}_f(\mathbf{x}) \leq \mathbf{x}'$  implies  $\widehat{Ch}_f(\mathbf{x}') = \widehat{Ch}_f(\mathbf{x})$ .*

Let  $\widehat{Ch}_F$  be the set of choice functions of all firms constructed in the above way. A continuum market induced from a matching market  $\Gamma$  is also summarized as a tuple  $\widehat{\Gamma} = (W, F, P_W, \widehat{Ch}_F)$ , where  $W, F$  and  $P_W$  are the same as those of  $\Gamma$ . A **matching**  $M$  in  $\widehat{\Gamma}$  assigns each firm a subpopulation of workers:  $M = (M_f)_{f \in \widetilde{F}}$  such that  $M_f \in [0, 1]^n$  for all  $f \in \widetilde{F}$  and  $\sum_{f \in \widetilde{F}} M_f(w) = 1$  for all  $w \in W$ . We use firms' choice functions to define the preferences of firms over matchings. Given two matchings  $M$  and  $M'$ , we say firm  $f$  prefers  $M'_f$  to  $M_f$ , denoted as  $M'_f \succeq_f M_f$ , if  $M'_f = \widehat{Ch}_f(M'_f \vee M_f)$ . We write  $M'_f \succ_f M_f$  to indicate that  $M'_f \succeq_f M_f$  and  $M'_f \neq M_f$ . For any matching  $M$  and firm  $f$ , the subpop-

ulation of workers assigned to firm  $f$  or some firm worse than  $f$  in  $M$  according to their preferences is denoted as  $D^{\preceq f}(M) \in [0, 1]^n$ , where  $D^{\preceq f}(M)(w) = \sum_{f' \in \tilde{F}: f \succeq_w f'} M_{f'}(w)$  for each  $w \in W$ .  $D^{\preceq f}(M)$  refers to the available subpopulation for  $f$  in  $M$ , since it measures the number of workers of each type who would rather match with  $f$  under matching  $M$ . The concept of stability in the continuum market  $\tilde{\Gamma}$  is then defined as:

**Definition 6.** A matching  $M = (M_f)_{f \in \tilde{F}}$  in  $\hat{\Gamma}$  is **stable** if

- (i) (Individual Rationality) For each  $f \in F$ ,  $M_f = \widehat{Ch}_f(M_f)$ ; and for all  $w \in W$ ,  $M_f(w) = 0$  for any  $f$  that satisfies  $\emptyset \succ_w f$ .
- (ii) (No Blocking Coalition) There are no  $f \in F$  and  $M'_f \in [0, 1]^n$  such that  $M'_f \succ_f M_f$  and  $M'_f \leq D^{\preceq f}(M)$ .

CKK's existence theorem says that a stable matching exists when each firm has a continuous choice function.<sup>15</sup> Then by Lemma 1, we know that there exists a stable matching in the continuum market  $\hat{\Gamma}$ .

**Example 3.** Consider a matching market  $\Gamma$  where there are two firms  $F = \{f_1, f_2\}$  and two workers  $W = \{w_1, w_2\}$ . The preferences of firms and workers are as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} f_1 : \{w_1, w_2\} \succ \{w_2\} \succ \emptyset & & w_1 : f_1 \succ f_2 \succ \emptyset \\ f_2 : \{w_1, w_2\} \succ \{w_1\} \succ \emptyset & & w_2 : f_2 \succ f_1 \succ \emptyset \end{aligned}$$

The above matching market induces a continuum market  $\hat{\Gamma}$ , where the choice functions  $\widehat{Ch}_{f_1}$  and  $\widehat{Ch}_{f_2}$  are generated from the above firms' preference profile via (2.1) and (2.2). By Lemma 1 and CKK's existence theorem, there is at least a stable matching in this continuum market. For instance, the matching in  $\hat{\Gamma}$  where  $f_1$  matches with (0.3,0.3) and  $f_2$  with (0.7,0.7) is stable. In this matching, under our constructed firms' preferences,

---

<sup>15</sup>See Theorem 2 of CKK. The revealed preference property of each firm's choice function is also a premise for their existence theorem. CKK's framework accommodates indifferences in firms' preferences. The requirements of continuity and convex-valuedness on firms' choice correspondences in their setting reduce to the continuity of firms' choice functions in our setting.

$f_1$  and  $f_2$  both would like to hire more workers of type- $w_1$  and type- $w_2$  in the ratio 1:1, but neither of the firms can draw workers of this ratio from the other firm.<sup>16</sup>  $f_1$  would get better if it could hire more type- $w_2$  workers,<sup>17</sup> but  $f_1$  is not attractive to the type- $w_2$  workers matched with  $f_2$ .  $f_2$  would get better if it could hire more type- $w_1$  workers, but  $f_2$  is not preferred by the type- $w_1$  workers matched with  $f_1$ .

We say a matching  $M$  in  $\widehat{\Gamma}$  is integral if  $M_f(w) \in \{0,1\}$  for all  $f \in \widetilde{F}$  and  $w \in W$ . Another observation is that each stable integral matching in the continuum market  $\widehat{\Gamma}$  is also a stable matching in the original market  $\Gamma$ . For instance, the stable integral matching in  $\widehat{\Gamma}$  where  $f_1$  matches with (1,1) and  $f_2$  with (0,0) is also a stable matching in  $\Gamma$ .

**Lemma 2.** *If  $M$  is a stable integral matching in the continuum market  $\widehat{\Gamma}$ , then  $\mu$  is a stable matching in the original matching market  $\Gamma$  where  $\mu(w) = f$  if  $M_f(w) = 1$  for each  $w \in W$  and  $f \in \widetilde{F}$ .*

### 2.3 Stable pseudo-matchings

In the continuum market  $\widehat{\Gamma}$ , we call  $M = (M_f)_{f \in \widetilde{F}}$  a **pseudo-matching** if  $M_f \in [0,1]^n$  for all  $f \in \widetilde{F}$ . A pseudo-matching may assign more than or less than the quantity of 1 workers of some worker type to firms. A pseudo-matching is a matching if  $\sum_{f \in \widetilde{F}} M_f(w) = 1$  for each  $w \in W$ . We say a pseudo-matching  $M$  is **stable** if it satisfies condition (i) and (ii) in Definition 6. In other words, a pseudo-matching  $M$  is stable if  $M$  is a stable matching when the quantity of each worker type  $w$  in the market is adjusted into its current quantity  $\sum_{f \in \widetilde{F}} M_f(w)$  in  $M$ .

**Example 4.** Consider the continuum market  $\widehat{\Gamma}$  in Example 3. Let  $M$  be the pseudo-matching where  $M_{f_1} = (0.6, 0.6)$ ,  $M_{f_2} = (0.3, 0.3)$  and  $M_\emptyset = (0, 0)$ , then  $M$  is a stable

<sup>16</sup>For instance,  $f_1$  would be better off when matched with (0.4,0.4). This is because  $\widehat{Ch}_{f_1}((0.4, 0.4) \vee (0.3, 0.3)) = (0.4, 0.4)$  indicates  $(0.4, 0.4) \succ_{f_1} (0.3, 0.3)$ . However,  $f_1$  cannot draw any type- $w_2$  workers from  $f_2$  since the type- $w_2$  workers prefer  $f_2$  to  $f_1$ .

<sup>17</sup>For example,  $f_1$  would be better off when matched with (0.3,0.4). This is because  $\widehat{Ch}_{f_1}((0.3, 0.4) \vee (0.3, 0.3)) = (0.3, 0.4)$  indicates  $(0.3, 0.4) \succ_{f_1} (0.3, 0.3)$ .

pseudo-matching. The reason is similar to that in Example 3.

Let  $M'$  be the pseudo-matching where  $M'_{f_1} = (0,0)$ ,  $M'_{f_2} = (0.3,0.3)$  and  $M'_\emptyset = (0,0)$ , readers can check that  $M'$  is also a stable pseudo-matching.

Given a stable pseudo-matching  $M$  in  $\widehat{\Gamma}$ , each of the following transformations on  $M$  produces a stable pseudo-matching  $M'$ .

**Type-1 stable transformation:** Choose a firm  $f'$  from  $F$  such that  $\sum_{j=1}^L t_j < 1$  holds in the procedure (2.1) that computes  $\widehat{Ch}_{f'}(M_{f'})$ . Let  $M'_{f'} = \mathbf{0}$  and let  $M'_f = M_f$  for all  $f \neq f'$ .

**Type-2 stable transformation:** Choose a firm  $f'$  from  $F$ . Consider the procedure (2.1) that computes  $\widehat{Ch}_{f'}(M_{f'}) = \sum_{j=1}^L t_j \mathbf{u}^j$ . If  $t_k > 0$  where  $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, L\}$ , then let  $M'_{f'} = \mathbf{u}^k$ . Let  $M'_f = M_f$  for all  $f \neq f'$ .

**Type-3 stable transformation:** If there exists  $w' \in W$  such that  $M_\emptyset(w') \in (0,1)$ , let  $M'_\emptyset(w') = 0$  or 1. Let  $M'_\emptyset(w) = M_\emptyset(w)$  for all  $w \neq w'$ , and  $M'_f = M_f$  for all  $f \in F$ .

**Example 5.** Consider the continuum market  $\widehat{\Gamma}$  in Example 3 with the stable pseudo-matchings  $M$  and  $M'$  in Example 4.  $M \rightarrow M'$  is a type-1 stable transformation. Note that in the procedure (2.1) that computes  $\widehat{Ch}_{f_1}(M_{f_1})$  we have  $\sum_{j=1}^L t_j = 0.6 < 1$ . Since  $f_1$  can not draw any subpopulation that includes both types from  $f_2$  in  $M$ ,  $f_1$  also can not do such things in  $M'$ , and thus this transformation maintains stability.

Let  $M''$  be the pseudo-matching where  $M''_{f_1} = (1,1)$ ,  $M''_{f_2} = (0.3,0.3)$  and  $M''_\emptyset = (0,0)$ , then  $M \rightarrow M''$  is a type-2 stable transformation. This transformation maintains stability because  $f_2$  can not draw any subpopulation that includes both types from  $f_1$  no matter when  $f_1$  is matched with  $(0.6,0.6)$  or  $(1,1)$ .

Let  $\widetilde{M}$  be the pseudo-matching where  $\widetilde{M}_{f_1} = (0,0)$ ,  $\widetilde{M}_{f_2} = (0.3,0.3)$  and  $\widetilde{M}_\emptyset = (0,0.2)$ . Let  $\widetilde{M}'$  be the pseudo-matching where  $\widetilde{M}'_{f_1} = (0,0)$ ,  $\widetilde{M}'_{f_2} = (0.3,0.3)$  and  $\widetilde{M}'_\emptyset = (0,1)$ . Then  $\widetilde{M} \rightarrow M'$  and  $\widetilde{M} \rightarrow \widetilde{M}'$  are both type-3 stable transformations. Unmatched workers in a stable matching can be viewed as redundant for firms, thus stability is not affected when the quantity of unmatched workers varies.

**Lemma 3.** *Each of the type-1, type-2, and type-3 stable transformations on a stable pseudo-matching produces a stable pseudo-matching.*

### 3 Illustrative example

Every matching market  $\Gamma$  induces a continuum market  $\hat{\Gamma}$ . According to the existence theorem of CKK, there exists a stable matching  $M$  in the continuum market  $\hat{\Gamma}$ . We then want to transform a stable matching  $M$  in  $\hat{\Gamma}$  via the stable transformations towards a stable integral pseudo-matching  $M'$  in  $\hat{\Gamma}$ . If we can finally reach an integral pseudo-matching  $M'$  that assigns precisely one quantity of workers of each type to firms, then  $M'$  is a stable integral matching, which by Lemma 2 corresponds to a stable matching in the original matching market  $\Gamma$ .

**Example 6.** Consider a matching market  $\Gamma$  where there are 2 firms  $F = \{f_1, f_2\}$  and 3 workers  $W = \{w_1, w_2, w_3\}$ . The preferences of firms and workers are as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
 f_1 : \{w_1, w_2\} \succ \{w_3\} \succ \emptyset & & w_1 : f_1 \succ f_2 \succ \emptyset \\
 f_2 : \{w_1, w_2\} \succ \emptyset & & w_2 : f_2 \succ f_1 \succ \emptyset \\
 & & w_3 : f_1 \succ \emptyset
 \end{aligned}$$

Consider a stable matching  $M$  in  $\hat{\Gamma}$  where  $M_{f_1} = (0.5, 0.5, 0.5)$ ,  $M_{f_2} = (0.5, 0.5, 0)$  and  $M_{\emptyset} = (0, 0, 0.5)$ .  $M$  is stable because neither of the firms can draw any subpopulation that includes both types from the other firm, and hiring more type- $w_3$  workers does not benefit  $f_1$ . In the following we represent a pseudo-matching in  $\hat{\Gamma}$  by a matrix, each row of which is the subpopulation matched with each firm.  $M$  is then represented by the following  $3 \times 3$  matrix.

	$w_1$	$w_2$	$w_3$
$f_1$	0.5	0.5	0.5
$f_2$	0.5	0.5	0
$\emptyset$	0	0	0.5

Consider the following transformations on  $M$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
& \begin{pmatrix} 0.5 & 0.5 & 0.5 \\ 0.5 & 0.5 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0.5 \end{pmatrix} \xrightarrow{(1)} \begin{pmatrix} 0.5 & 0.5 & 0.5 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0.5 \end{pmatrix} \xrightarrow{(2)} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0.5 \end{pmatrix} \\
& \xrightarrow{(3)} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}
\end{aligned}$$

Transformations (1), (2), and (3) are type-1, type-2, and type-3 stable transformations, respectively. It turns out that we finally reach a stable integral matching  $M'$  in  $\widehat{\Gamma}$ , where  $M'_{f_1} = (1, 1, 0)$ ,  $M'_{f_2} = (0, 0, 0)$  and  $M'_{\emptyset} = (0, 0, 1)$ .

A critical observation is that we can reach a stable integral matching through stable transformations on  $M$  when there is a nonnegative integral solution to the following system of linear equations.

$$A^* \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} z_1 \\ z_2 \\ z_3 \\ z_4 \\ z_5 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \right.$$

Let  $A$  denote the  $5 \times 5$  matrix on the left and  $A^*$  the  $3 \times 5$  submatrix that includes the 3th to 5th rows of  $A$ . Let  $A_i$  and  $A_i^*$  be the vector of the  $i$ th column of  $A$  and  $A^*$ , respectively.  $A_1^*$  and  $A_2^*$  correspond to  $\{w_1, w_2\}$  and  $\{w_3\}$  in  $f_1$ 's preference list.  $A_3^*$  and  $A_4^*$  correspond to  $\{w_1, w_2\}$  and  $\emptyset$  in  $f_2$ 's preference list.  $A_5^*$  correspond to  $\{w_3\}$ .  $\mathbf{z} =$

$(0.5, 0.5, 0.5, 0.5, 0.5)$  is a solution to this system, which refers to matching  $M$  as follows.

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} & f_1 & f_2 & \emptyset \\ z_1(1, 1, 0) + z_2(0, 0, 1) & z_3(1, 1, 0) + z_4(0, 0, 0) & z_5(0, 0, 1) \end{pmatrix} \quad (3.1)$$

$(z_1, z_2) = (0.5, 0.5)$  corresponds to  $(t_1, t_2)$  in the procedure (2.1) that computes  $\widehat{Ch}_{f_1}(0.5, 0.5, 0.5)$ .  $(z_3, z_4) = (0.5, 0.5)$  corresponds to  $(t_1, 1 - t_1)$  in the procedure (2.1) that computes  $\widehat{Ch}_{f_2}(0.5, 0.5, 0)$ .  $z_5 = 0.5$  corresponds to  $M_\emptyset = (0, 0, 0.5)$ . Note that (3.1) with any  $\mathbf{z} \in \{0, 1\}^5$  that satisfies  $z_1 + z_2 = 1$  and  $z_3 + z_4 = 1$  (guaranteed by the first and second row of  $A$ ) corresponds to a stable pseudo-matching obtained from  $M$  via stable transformations. Then any  $\mathbf{z} \in \{0, 1\}^5$  that satisfies  $A\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{1}$  corresponds to a stable integral matching, since  $A^*\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{1}$  requires that the workers of each type assigned to firms is of quantity 1. For instance,  $\mathbf{z}' = (1, 0, 0, 1, 1)$  is a solution to the system and we obtain the stable integral matching  $M'$  by plugging  $\mathbf{z}'$  into (3.1).

Therefore, given a stable matching  $M$  in the continuum market  $\widehat{\Gamma}$ , we can construct a system of linear equations  $A\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{1}$ . Our construction guarantees that the polyhedron  $\{\mathbf{z} \mid A\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{z} \geq 0\}$  is nonempty because  $M$  corresponds to a nonnegative solution of this system of equations. Our construction also guarantees that every integral point in this polyhedron corresponds to a stable matching in the original matching market. Now we can apply standard results from integer programming to this problem. Under the condition that the set of columns of  $A$  is unimodular, all vertices of the polyhedron  $\{\mathbf{z} \mid A\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{z} \geq 0\}$  are integral (see, e.g., Theorem 21.5 of Schrijver, 1986). Since the polyhedron is nonempty, we know that there is at least an integral vertex on this polyhedron. Finally, it is not difficult to find out that the set of the columns of  $A$  is unimodular when the demand type of firms  $\mathcal{D}$  is unimodular. In this example, we have  $\mathcal{D}_{f_1} = \{(1, 1, 0), (1, 1, -1), (0, 0, 1)\}$ ,  $\mathcal{D}_{f_2} = \{(1, 1, 0)\}$ , and  $\mathcal{D}_\emptyset = \{(1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0), (0, 0, 1)\}$ . The preference profile of firms is of demand type  $\mathcal{D} = \{(1, 1, 0), (1, 1, -1), (1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0), (0, 0, 1)\}$ ,



which is unimodular. Now we illustrate why the unimodularity of  $\mathcal{D}$  implies the unimodularity of the set of columns from matrix  $A$ . For instance,  $A_1, A_2, A_3$  and  $A_5$  are linearly independent. The unimodularity of  $\mathcal{D}$  guarantees that the set of  $\{A_1^* - A_2^*, A_5^*\}$  can be extended to a basis of  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , of integer vectors, with determinant  $\pm 1$ . Then we know that  $\{A_1, A_3\} \cup \{A_1 - A_2, A_5\}$  can be extended to a basis of  $\mathbb{R}^5$ , of integer vectors, with determinant  $\pm 1$ . Therefore, such extension also exists for the set of  $\{A_1, A_2, A_3, A_5\}$ .

## 4 Result

We find that a stable matching exists in a matching market for all possible preferences of workers, provided the demand type of firms is unimodular.

**Theorem 1.** *There exists a stable matching in  $\Gamma$  if the demand type of firms  $\mathcal{D}$  is unimodular.*

Unimodular preferences with complementarities are prevalent. Preference profiles of firms in (1.2), Example 1, and Example 3 are concrete instances when there are only two firms and two workers. Readers can easily construct markets where there are more workers and firms with preferences that exhibit both unimodularities and complementarities.

In general equilibria with indivisible goods, the condition of gross substitutes (Kelso and Crawford 1982) and gross substitutes and complements (Sun and Yang, 2006) imply unimodularity.<sup>18</sup> However, unimodularity is independent of substitutability in matching markets. Firms' preferences in (1.2), Example 1, and Example 3 are not substitutable, but all of them are of unimodular demand types. The following is an example of firms' substitutable preferences, which fail to be of unimodular demand type.

**Example 7.** There are two firms  $f_1, f_2$ , and two workers  $w_1, w_2$ . The firms have the following preferences.

$$f_1 : \{w_1, w_2\} \succ \{w_1\} \succ \{w_2\} \succ \emptyset \qquad f_2 : \{w_1\} \succ \{w_2\} \succ \emptyset$$

---

<sup>18</sup>See Section 3.2 of BK.

Both firms have substitutable preferences. However, we have  $\mathcal{D}_{f_1} = \{(1, 1), (1, 0), (0, 1)\}$ ,  $\mathcal{D}_{f_2} = \{(1, 0), (0, 1), (1, -1)\}$ , and  $\mathcal{D}_\emptyset = \{(1, 0), (0, 1)\}$ . Firms' preference profile is of demand type  $\mathcal{D} = \{(1, 1), (1, 0), (0, 1), (1, -1)\}$ , which is not unimodular.

## 5 Conclusion

The Gale-Shapley mechanism is the main tool for market designers to find stable matchings in real-life markets. This method relies on the assumption that all agents have substitutable preferences. This paper develops a new integer programming approach to study matching markets. We find that a stable matching is guaranteed to exist when firms' preference profile satisfies the unimodularity condition. Firms' preferences of unimodular demand type allow for various forms of complementarities. We believe our method will be useful for market designers to handle problems that were deemed intractable before. We leave for future research on how to find a stable matching under the condition of unimodularity and how to apply our approach to real-life matching markets.

## 6 Appendix

### 6.1 Proofs for Section 2

*Proof of Lemma 1*

(1) Revealed preference property. For any  $\mathbf{x}, \tilde{\mathbf{x}} \in [0, 1]^n$  with  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} \leq \mathbf{x}$  and  $\widehat{Ch}_f(\mathbf{x}) \leq \tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ , consider the procedures (2.1) that compute  $\widehat{Ch}_f(\mathbf{x})$  and  $\widehat{Ch}_f(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})$ . Let  $(t_k)_{k=1}^L$  and  $(\mathbf{z}^k)_{k=1}^L$  be the parameters in computing  $\widehat{Ch}_f(\mathbf{x})$ . Let  $(\tilde{t}_k)_{k=1}^L$  and  $(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^k)_{k=1}^L$  be the parameters in computing  $\widehat{Ch}_f(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})$ .

Since  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} \leq \mathbf{x}$ , we have  $\tilde{t}_1 \leq t_1$ . Suppose  $\tilde{t}_1 < t_1$ , we have  $\widehat{Ch}_f(\mathbf{x}) \geq t_1 \mathbf{u}^1$  but  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} \geq t_1 \mathbf{u}^1$  does not hold. This contradicts  $\widehat{Ch}_f(\mathbf{x}) \leq \tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ . Thus, we have  $t_1 = \tilde{t}_1$ , and then  $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^1 \leq \mathbf{z}^1$ .

Suppose for all  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, k-1\}$ , we have  $t_j = \tilde{t}_j$  and  $\mathbf{z}^j \geq \tilde{\mathbf{z}}^j$ . Then, since  $\mathbf{z}^{k-1} \geq$

$\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^{k-1}$ , we have  $\tilde{t}_k \leq t_k$ . Suppose  $\tilde{t}_k < t_k$ , we have  $\widehat{Ch}_f(\mathbf{x}) \geq \sum_{j=1}^k t_j \mathbf{u}^j$  but  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} \geq \sum_{j=1}^k t_j \mathbf{u}^j$  does not hold. This contradicts  $\widehat{Ch}_f(\mathbf{x}) \leq \tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ . Thus, we have  $t_k = \tilde{t}_k$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^k \leq \mathbf{z}^k$ .

According to the above inductive arguments, the procedures that compute  $\widehat{Ch}_f(\mathbf{x})$  and  $\widehat{Ch}_f(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})$  coincide, and we have  $\widehat{Ch}_f(\mathbf{x}) = \widehat{Ch}_f(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})$ .

(2) Continuity. For any  $\mathbf{x}, \tilde{\mathbf{x}} \in [0, 1]^n$ , let  $d(\mathbf{x}, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}) = \max_{i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}} |x_i - \tilde{x}_i|$  be the maximum metric. Consider the procedures (2.1) that compute  $\widehat{Ch}_f(\mathbf{x})$  and  $\widehat{Ch}_f(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})$ , where  $d(\mathbf{x}, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}) < v$ . Let  $(t_k)_{k=1}^L$  and  $(\mathbf{z}^k)_{k=1}^L$  be the parameters in computing  $\widehat{Ch}_f(\mathbf{x})$ . Let  $(\tilde{t}_k)_{k=1}^L$  and  $(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^k)_{k=1}^L$  be the parameters in computing  $\widehat{Ch}_f(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})$ .

Since  $d(\mathbf{x}, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}) < v$ , we have  $|t_1 - \tilde{t}_1| < v$  and  $d(t_1 \mathbf{u}^1, \tilde{t}_1 \mathbf{u}^1) < v$ . Then  $d(\mathbf{z}^1, \tilde{\mathbf{z}}^1) = \max_{i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}} |x_i - t_1 u_i^1 - \tilde{x}_i + \tilde{t}_1 u_i^1| < 2v$ .

We then establish the following inductive arguments. Suppose we have  $|t_j - \tilde{t}_j| < 2^{j-1}v$  and  $d(\mathbf{z}^j, \tilde{\mathbf{z}}^j) < 2^j v$  for all  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, k-1\}$ . Then we have  $|\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} t_j - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \tilde{t}_j| < (2^{k-1} - 1)v$ . We then consider four cases:

- (i)  $\sum_{j=1}^k t_j < 1$  and  $\sum_{j=1}^k \tilde{t}_j < 1$ . Since  $d(\mathbf{z}^{k-1}, \tilde{\mathbf{z}}^{k-1}) < 2^{k-1}v$ , we have  $|t_k - \tilde{t}_k| < 2^{k-1}v$ .
- (ii)  $\sum_{j=1}^k t_j = \sum_{j=1}^k \tilde{t}_j = 1$ . We have  $|t_k - \tilde{t}_k| < (2^{k-1} - 1)v$ ;
- (iii)  $\sum_{j=1}^k t_j = 1$  and  $\sum_{j=1}^k \tilde{t}_j < 1$ . We have  $\sum_{j=1}^k \tilde{t}_j = \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \tilde{t}_j + \tilde{t}_k < 1 = \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} t_j + t_k$ , and thus  $t_k - \tilde{t}_k > \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \tilde{t}_j - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} t_j > -(2^{k-1} - 1)v$ . Since  $d(\mathbf{z}^{k-1}, \tilde{\mathbf{z}}^{k-1}) < 2^{k-1}v$  and  $\sum_{j=1}^k \tilde{t}_j < 1$  also imply  $t_k < \tilde{t}_k + 2^{k-1}v$ , we have  $|t_k - \tilde{t}_k| < 2^{k-1}v$ .
- (iv)  $\sum_{j=1}^k t_j < 1$  and  $\sum_{j=1}^k \tilde{t}_j = 1$ , this is symmetric to (iii) and we also have  $|t_k - \tilde{t}_k| < 2^{k-1}v$ .

According to the above inductive arguments, for each  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, L\}$ , we have  $|t_j - \tilde{t}_j| < 2^{j-1}v$  and then  $d(t_j \mathbf{u}^j, \tilde{t}_j \mathbf{u}^j) < 2^{j-1}v$ . We have  $d(\widehat{Ch}_f(\mathbf{x}), \widehat{Ch}_f(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})) < (2^L - 1)v$ .

Therefore, for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists  $\delta = \frac{\epsilon}{(2^L - 1)\sqrt{n}}$  such that  $|\mathbf{x} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}| < \delta$  implies  $d(\mathbf{x}, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}) < \delta$ , and then  $d(\widehat{Ch}_f(\mathbf{x}), \widehat{Ch}_f(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})) < \frac{\epsilon}{\sqrt{n}}$ , which further implies  $|\widehat{Ch}_f(\mathbf{x}) - \widehat{Ch}_f(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})| < \epsilon$ .<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup>  $|\cdot|$  is the Euclidean distance.

*Proof of Lemma 2*

We first prove that for any integral  $\mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^n$ ,  $\widehat{Ch}_f(\mathbf{x}) = Ch_f(\mathbf{x})$ . Let  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, L\}$  be the index such that  $\mathbf{u}^j \leq \mathbf{x}$ , and  $\mathbf{u}^k \leq \mathbf{x}$  does not hold for all  $k < j$ . (If such  $j$  does not exist, we have  $\widehat{Ch}_f(\mathbf{x}) = Ch_f(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}$ .) Then we have  $t_k = 0$  for all  $k < j$ ,  $t_j = 1$ , and  $t_k = 0$  for all  $j < k \leq L$ . Therefore, we have  $\widehat{Ch}_f(\mathbf{x}) = Ch_f(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{u}^j$ .

Let  $M = (M_f)_{f \in \tilde{F}}$  be a stable integral matching in a continuum market  $\widehat{\Gamma}$ . Let  $\mu$  be the matching in  $\Gamma$  such that  $\mu(w) = f$  and  $w \in \mu(f)$  if  $M_f(w) = 1$  for each  $w \in W$  and  $f \in \tilde{F}$ .

(1) Individual rationality. For any  $f \in F$ , since  $M_f$  is integral, we have  $\widehat{Ch}_f(M_f) = Ch_f(M_f)$ . The individual rationality of firms in  $M$  in  $\widehat{\Gamma}$  implies that for each  $f \in F$ ,  $M_f = \widehat{Ch}_f(M_f) = Ch_f(M_f)$ . Because  $workers(M_f) = \mu(f)$ , we have  $\mu(f) = Ch_f(\mu(f))$ . The individual rationality of workers in  $M$  in  $\widehat{\Gamma}$  also implies the individual rationality of workers in  $\mu$ .

(2) No blocking coalition. Suppose  $f$  and a subset of workers  $S \subseteq W$  block  $\mu$  in  $\Gamma$ , where  $vector(S) = M'$ . Since  $S \succ_f \mu(f)$  in  $\Gamma$ , we have  $\widehat{Ch}_f(M' \vee M) = Ch_f(M' \vee M) \neq M$ . Then by revealed preference property, we have  $\widehat{Ch}_f(M' \vee M) \succ_f M$  in  $\widehat{\Gamma}$ . Since  $f \succeq_w \mu(w)$  for all  $w \in S$  in  $\Gamma$ , then  $\widehat{Ch}_f(M' \vee M) \leq M' \vee M \leq D^{\preceq f}(M)$ . Thus  $f$  and  $\widehat{Ch}_f(M' \vee M)$  block  $M$  in  $\widehat{\Gamma}$ . A contradiction.

*Proof of Lemma 3*

We first prove the following two lemmata. For each  $f \in F$ , let  $D^{\prec f}(M) \in [0, 1]^n$  be the subpopulation such that  $D^{\prec f}(M)(w) = \sum_{f' \in \tilde{F}: f \succ_w f'} M_{f'}(w)$  for each  $w \in W$ .  $D^{\prec f}(M)$  is the subpopulation of workers assigned to some firm worse than  $f$  in  $M$  according to their preferences. Note that  $D^{\prec f}(M) + M_f = D^{\preceq f}(M)$  for each  $f \in F$ .

**Lemma 4.** *Let  $M$  be a pseudo-matching and there is a firm  $f' \in F$  such that  $\widehat{Ch}_{f'}(M_{f'}) = M_{f'}$ . Consider the procedure (2.1) that computes  $\widehat{Ch}_{f'}(M_{f'}) = \sum_{j=1}^L t_j \mathbf{u}^j$ . There exists a blocking coalition that involves  $f'$  if and only if there exists  $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, L\}$  such that  $\sum_{j=1}^k t_j < 1$  and*

$\mathbf{u}^k \leq \text{integral}(D^{\prec f'}(M))$ .

*Proof.* “ $\Leftarrow$ ”.  $\mathbf{u}^k \leq \text{integral}(D^{\prec f'}(M))$  implies that there exists  $\epsilon > 0$  such that  $\epsilon \mathbf{u}^k \leq D^{\prec f'}(M)$ . Then the revealed preference property and  $\sum_{j=1}^k t_j < 1$  imply  $\widehat{Ch}_{f'}(\epsilon \mathbf{u}^k + M_{f'}) = \widehat{Ch}_{f'}[\widehat{Ch}_{f'}(\epsilon \mathbf{u}^k + M_{f'}) \vee M_{f'}] \neq M_{f'}$ . We also have  $\widehat{Ch}_{f'}(\epsilon \mathbf{u}^k + M_{f'}) \leq \epsilon \mathbf{u}^k + M_{f'} \leq D^{\prec f'}(M) + M_{f'} = D^{\preceq f'}(M)$ . Hence,  $f'$  and  $\widehat{Ch}_{f'}(\epsilon \mathbf{u}^k + M_{f'})$  form a blocking coalition.

“ $\Rightarrow$ ”. If  $t_1 = 1$ , then  $M_{f'} = \mathbf{u}^1$  and there is no blocking coalition that involves  $f'$ . Thus there exists  $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, L\}$  such that  $\sum_{j=1}^k t_j < 1$ . Suppose for all such  $k$ ,  $\mathbf{u}^k \leq \text{integral}(D^{\prec f'}(M))$  does not hold. Then consider the procedures (2.1) that compute  $\widehat{Ch}_{f'}(M_{f'})$  and  $\widehat{Ch}_{f'}(D^{\preceq f'}(M)) = \sum_{j=1}^L \widehat{t}_j \mathbf{u}^j$ . Since  $D^{\preceq f'}(M) = M_{f'} + D^{\prec f'}(M)$ , and  $\mathbf{u}^k \leq \text{integral}(D^{\prec f'}(M))$  does not hold for all  $k$  when  $\sum_{j=1}^k t_j < 1$ , we know that  $t_j = \widehat{t}_j$  for all  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, L\}$ . Thus we have  $\widehat{Ch}_{f'}(M_{f'}) = \widehat{Ch}_{f'}(D^{\preceq f'}(M))$ , and by revealed preference property there is no blocking coalition that involves  $f'$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 5.** *Let  $M$  be a stable pseudo-matching. Choose  $f' \in F$  and let  $M'$  be a pseudo-matching such that  $M'_{f'}(w) = 0$  if  $M_{f'}(w) = 0$  for each  $w \in W$ , and  $M'_f = M_f$  for all  $f \neq f'$ . Then there exists no blocking coalition that involves  $f \neq f'$  in  $M'$ .*

*Proof.* For any  $f \neq f'$  consider the procedure (2.1) that computes  $Ch_f(M_f) = Ch_f(M'_f) = \sum_{j=1}^L t_j \mathbf{u}^j$ . Since  $M$  is stable, by Lemma 4 for all  $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, L\}$  such that  $\sum_{j=1}^k t_j < 1$ ,  $\mathbf{u}^k \leq \text{integral}(D^{\prec f}(M))$  does not hold. Since  $M'_{f'}(w) = 0$  if  $M_{f'}(w) = 0$ , we have  $\text{integral}(D^{\prec f}(M')) \leq \text{integral}(D^{\prec f}(M))$ . Therefore, for all  $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, L\}$  such that  $\sum_{j=1}^k t_j < 1$ ,  $\mathbf{u}^k \leq \text{integral}(D^{\prec f}(M'))$  does not hold for all  $f \neq f'$ . By Lemma 4, there exists no blocking coalition that involves  $f \neq f'$  in  $M'$ .  $\square$

In each of the three transformations, since we set  $M'_f(w) = 1$  only when  $M_f(w) > 0$  for each  $f \in \widetilde{F}$  and each  $w \in W$ , the workers' individual rationality holds for  $M'$  from the individual rationality of  $M$ . It is also straightforward to see that the firms' individual rationality also holds. By Lemma 5, in each of the type-1 and type-2 transformations,

there exists no blocking coalition that involves  $f \neq f'$  in  $M'$ . Let  $\mathbf{u}^1 \succ \mathbf{u}^2 \succ \dots \succ \mathbf{u}^L \succ \mathbf{0}$  be the preference order of firm  $f'$  over its acceptable sets of workers in  $\Gamma$ .

(1) Type-1. Suppose in  $M'$ , there exists a blocking coalition that involves  $f'$ . Consider the procedure (2.1) that computes  $\widehat{Ch}_{f'}(M'_{f'}) = \sum_{j=1}^L t'_j \mathbf{u}^j$ . Since  $M'_{f'} = \mathbf{0}$ , then  $t'_j = 0$  for all  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, L\}$ . By Lemma 4, there exists  $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, L\}$  such that  $\mathbf{u}^k \leq \text{integral}(D^{\prec f'}(M')) = \text{integral}(D^{\prec f'}(M))$ . Consider the procedure (2.1) that computes  $\widehat{Ch}_{f'}(M_{f'}) = \sum_{j=1}^L t_j \mathbf{u}^j$ . Since  $\sum_{j=1}^L t_j < 1$  and there exists  $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, L\}$  such that  $\mathbf{u}^k \leq \text{integral}(D^{\prec f'}(M))$ , by Lemma 4,  $M$  is not stable. A contradiction.

(2) Type-2. Suppose in  $M'$ , there exists a blocking coalition that involves  $f'$ . Consider the procedure (2.1) that computes  $\widehat{Ch}_{f'}(M'_{f'}) = \sum_{j=1}^L t'_j \mathbf{u}^j$ . Since  $M'_{f'} = \mathbf{u}^k$ , by Lemma 4, there exists  $k' < k$  such that  $\mathbf{u}^{k'} \leq \text{integral}(D^{\prec f'}(M'))$ . Then Consider the procedure (2.1) that computes  $\widehat{Ch}_{f'}(M_{f'}) = \sum_{j=1}^L t_j \mathbf{u}^j$ . Since  $t_k > 0$ , we have  $\sum_{j=1}^{k'} t_j < 1$ , and  $\mathbf{u}^{k'} \leq \text{integral}(D^{\prec f'}(M')) = \text{integral}(D^{\prec f'}(M))$ . By Lemma 4,  $M$  is not stable. A contradiction.

(3) Type-3. If we set  $M'_\theta(w') = 0$  for some  $w' \in W$  such that  $M_\theta(w') \in (0, 1)$ , then for each  $f \in F$ ,  $D^{\preceq f}(M') \leq D^{\preceq f}(M)$ . Any  $f \in F$  that can form a blocking coalition with some  $M''_f$  in  $M'$ , can also form a blocking coalition with  $M''_f$  in  $M$ .

If we set  $M'_\theta(w') = 1$  for some  $w' \in W$  such that  $M_\theta(w') \in (0, 1)$ , then for any  $f \in F$ ,  $\text{integral}(D^{\preceq f}(M)) = \text{integral}(D^{\preceq f}(M'))$ . If there exists a blocking coalition that involves  $f$  in  $M'$ , then by Lemma 4, there also exists a blocking coalition that involves  $f$  in  $M$ .

## 6.2 Proofs for Section 4

### *Proof of Theorem 1*

The proof of Theorem 1 is illustrated by Example 6. Every matching market  $\Gamma$  induces a continuum market  $\widehat{\Gamma}$ , where Lemma 1 and the existence theorem of CKK indicate that a stable matching  $M$  is guaranteed to exist in  $\widehat{\Gamma}$ . For each  $f \in F$ , consider the procedure (2.1) that computes  $\widehat{Ch}_f(M_f) = \sum_{j=1}^L t_j \mathbf{u}^j = M_f$ , where the last equality is implied by the

individual rationality of firms in  $M$ . We then construct a matrix  $A^{*f}$  as follows.

$$A^{*f} = \begin{cases} [\mathbf{u}^{k_1}, \mathbf{u}^{k_2}, \dots, \mathbf{u}^{k_s}], & \text{if } \sum_{j=1}^L t_j = 1. \\ [\mathbf{u}^{k_1}, \mathbf{u}^{k_2}, \dots, \mathbf{u}^{k_s}, \mathbf{0}], & \text{if } \sum_{j=1}^L t_j < 1. \end{cases} \quad (6.1)$$

where  $t_l > 0$  for each  $l \in \{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_s\}$  and  $k_1 < k_2 < \dots < k_s$ .<sup>20</sup>

We then construct matrix  $A^\emptyset$  and  $A^f$  for each  $f \in F$ . Each column of  $A^\emptyset$  is an  $(m+n)$ -dimensional unit vector, where the  $(m+j)$ -th unit vector is in  $A^\emptyset$  if  $M_\emptyset(w_j) > 0$ .<sup>21</sup> We construct  $A^f$  from  $A^{*f}$  for each  $f \in F$ . Each  $A^f$  has  $m+n$  rows, where the first  $m$  components of each column are the components of the  $i$ -th unit vector of dimension  $m$  when  $f = f_i$ . The last  $n$  components of each column of  $A^f$  are those of each column of  $A^{*f}$ . Then let matrix  $A = [A^{f_1}, A^{f_2}, \dots, A^{f_m}, A^\emptyset]$ . Let  $cl(f)$  be the number of columns of  $A^f$  for each  $f \in \tilde{F}$ .<sup>22</sup> Thus,  $A$  is an  $(m+n) \times \sum_{f \in \tilde{F}} cl(f)$  matrix. Theorem 1 is then implied by the following lemma and Lemma 2.

**Lemma 6.** *Consider the system of linear equations  $A\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{1}$ , where  $\mathbf{z}$  is a  $\sum_{f \in \tilde{F}} cl(f)$ -dimensional vector, and  $\mathbf{1}$  is the  $(m+n)$ -dimensional vector with all its coordinates being 1. If the demand type of firms  $\mathcal{D}$  is unimodular, then there exists a solution  $\mathbf{z} = (\mathbf{z}^{f_1}, \mathbf{z}^{f_2}, \dots, \mathbf{z}^{f_m}, \mathbf{z}^\emptyset) \in \{0, 1\}^{\sum_{f \in \tilde{F}} cl(f)}$  to  $A\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{1}$ , where  $\mathbf{z}^f$  is a  $cl(f)$ -dimensional vector for each  $f \in \tilde{F}$ .<sup>23</sup> Then  $M'$  is a stable integral matching in  $\hat{\Gamma}$ , where  $M'_f = \sum_{j=1}^{cl(f)} z_j^f A_j^{*f}$  for each  $f \in \tilde{F}$ .<sup>24</sup>*

*Proof.* We first show that the polyhedron  $\{\mathbf{z} \mid A\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{z} \geq 0\}$  is nonempty. For each

<sup>20</sup>In (6.1), for each  $l \in \{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_s\}$ ,  $\mathbf{u}^l$  is a column of matrix  $A^{*f}$ .  $A^{*f}$  is an  $n \times s$  or  $n \times (s+1)$  matrix. The numbers  $\{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_s\}$  and  $s$  are different for different firms.

<sup>21</sup>The  $(m+j)$ -th unit vector is the  $(m+n)$ -dimensional unit vector with its  $(m+j)$ -th coordinate being 1.

<sup>22</sup> $cl(f)$  corresponds to  $s$  or  $s+1$  in (6.1).

<sup>23</sup>By  $\mathbf{z} = (\mathbf{z}^{f_1}, \mathbf{z}^{f_2}, \dots, \mathbf{z}^{f_m}, \mathbf{z}^\emptyset)$  we mean the first  $cl(f_1)$  components of  $\mathbf{z}$  are the components of  $\mathbf{z}^{f_1}$ , the  $(cl(f_1) + 1)$ -th to  $(cl(f_1) + cl(f_2))$ -th components are the components of  $\mathbf{z}^{f_2}$ , and so on.

<sup>24</sup> $A_j^{*f}$  is the vector of the  $j$ -th column of  $A^{*f}$ .

$f \in F$ , consider the procedure (2.1) that computes  $\widehat{Ch}_f(M_f) = \sum_{j=1}^L t_j \mathbf{u}^j = M_f$  and let

$$\widehat{\mathbf{z}}^f = \begin{cases} (t_{k_1}, t_{k_2}, \dots, t_{k_s}), & \text{if } \sum_{j=1}^L t_j = 1. \\ (t_{k_1}, t_{k_2}, \dots, t_{k_s}, 1 - \sum_{i=1}^s t_{k_i}), & \text{if } \sum_{j=1}^L t_j < 1. \end{cases}$$

where  $k_1, k_2, \dots, k_s$  are those in (6.1). Let  $\widehat{\mathbf{z}}^\emptyset$  be the  $cl(\emptyset)$ -dimensional vector where  $\widehat{z}_l^\emptyset = M_\emptyset(w_j)$  if  $A_l^\emptyset$  is the  $(m+j)$ -th unit vector for each  $l \in \{1, \dots, cl(\emptyset)\}$ . Let  $A^{**}$  be the matrix constituted of the first  $m$  rows of  $A$ , and  $A^*$  the matrix constituted of the last  $n$  rows of  $A$ . Let  $\widehat{\mathbf{z}} = (\widehat{\mathbf{z}}^{f_1}, \widehat{\mathbf{z}}^{f_2}, \dots, \widehat{\mathbf{z}}^{f_m}, \widehat{\mathbf{z}}^\emptyset)$ .  $\sum_{i=1}^{cl(f)} \widehat{z}_i^f = 1$  for each  $f \in F$  implies  $A^{**}\widehat{\mathbf{z}} = \mathbf{1}$ , and  $\sum_{f \in \widetilde{F}} M_f(w) = 1$  for each  $w \in W$  implies  $A^*\widehat{\mathbf{z}} = \mathbf{1}$ . Hence, we know  $\widehat{\mathbf{z}}$  is in  $\{\mathbf{z} \mid A\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{z} \geq 0\}$ .

If the set of columns of  $A$  is unimodular, all vertices of the polyhedron  $\{\mathbf{z} \mid A\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{z} \geq 0\}$  are integral (see, e.g., Theorem 21.5 of Schrijver, 1986). Then since the polyhedron is nonempty, we know that there is at least an integral vertex on this polyhedron. We now show that the set of columns of  $A$  is unimodular if the demand type of firms  $\mathcal{D}$  is unimodular. For any linearly independent subset  $\widehat{A}$  of columns from  $A$ , we partition  $\widehat{A}$  into  $\widehat{A} = \cup_{f \in \widetilde{F}} \widehat{A}^f$ , where  $\widehat{A}^f$  is the collection of vectors of  $\widehat{A}$  from  $A^f$  for each  $f \in \widetilde{F}$ .  $\widehat{A}^f$  is possibly empty for some  $f \in \widetilde{F}$ . Let  $\mathbf{a}_1^f, \mathbf{a}_2^f, \dots$  denote the elements of  $\widehat{A}^f$  for each  $f \in \widetilde{F}$  if  $\widehat{A}^f$  is not empty. If  $\widehat{A}^f$  is empty, let  $\mathbf{a}_1^f$  be the  $i$ -th unit vector of  $m+n$  dimensions when  $f = f_i$ . For each  $f \in F$ , let  $B^f = \{\mathbf{a}_2^f - \mathbf{a}_1^f, \mathbf{a}_3^f - \mathbf{a}_1^f, \dots\}$  if there are at least 2 elements in  $\widehat{A}^f$ , and  $B^f = \emptyset$  otherwise. Let  $\widetilde{A} = (\cup_{f \in F} B^f) \cup \{\mathbf{a}_1^\emptyset, \mathbf{a}_2^\emptyset, \dots\}$ . Note that the first  $m$  coordinates of each vector from  $\widetilde{A}$  are 0. Let  $\widetilde{A}^*$  be the set of  $n$ -dimensional vectors by deleting the first  $m$  components of each vector from  $\widetilde{A}$ . If  $\mathcal{D}$  is unimodular,  $\widetilde{A}^*$  can be extended to a basis of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , of integer vectors, with determinant  $\pm 1$ . Then the set  $\widetilde{A} \cup \{\mathbf{a}_1^{f_1}, \mathbf{a}_1^{f_2}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_1^{f_m}\}$  can be extended to a basis of  $\mathbb{R}^{m+n}$ , of integer vectors, with determinant  $\pm 1$ . Thus, such extension also exists for  $(\cup_{f \in F} \{\mathbf{a}_1^f, \mathbf{a}_2^f, \dots\}) \cup \{\mathbf{a}_1^\emptyset, \mathbf{a}_2^\emptyset, \dots\}$ , which can be extended from  $\widehat{A}$ . Therefore, the set of columns of  $A$  is unimodular.



Now we know there is at least an integral point in the polyhedron  $\{\mathbf{z} \mid A\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{z} \geq 0\}$  when the demand type of firms  $\mathcal{D}$  is unimodular. According to the structure of matrix  $A$ , any nonnegative integral solution to  $A\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{1}$  must be a 0-1 vector. Let  $\mathbf{z} = (\mathbf{z}^{f_1}, \mathbf{z}^{f_2}, \dots, \mathbf{z}^{f_m}, \mathbf{z}^\emptyset)$  be an integral point of  $\{\mathbf{z} \mid A\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{z} \geq 0\}$ , where  $\mathbf{z}^f$  is a  $cl(f)$ -dimensional vector for each  $f \in \tilde{F}$ . Let  $M'$  be the integral pseudo-matching in  $\hat{\Phi}$ , where  $M'_f = \sum_{j=1}^{cl(f)} z_j^f A_j^{*f}$  for each  $f \in \tilde{F}$ . Because  $A^{**}\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{1}$ , we know that  $M'$  can be obtained via stable transformations on  $M$ . By Lemma 3,  $M'$  is a stable integral pseudo-matching. Since  $A^*\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{1}$  implies  $\sum_{f \in \tilde{F}} M'_f(w) = 1$  for each  $w \in W$ , we know that  $M'$  is a stable integral matching.  $\square$

## References

- Abdulkadiroğlu, A., Sönmez, T., 2003. School Choice: A Mechanism Design Approach. *American Economic Review*, 93, 729-747.
- Abdulkadiroğlu, A., Pathak, P.A., Roth, A.E., 2009. Strategy-Proofness versus Efficiency in Matching With Indifferences: Redesigning the NYC High School Match. *American Economic Review*, 99, 1954-1978.
- Adachi, H., 2000. On a characterization of stable matchings. *Economic Letters*, 68, 43-49.
- Azevedo, E.M., Weyl, E.G., White, A., 2013. Walrasian equilibrium in large, quasi-linear markets. *Theoretical Economics*, 8(2), 281-290.
- Azevedo, E.M., Hatfield, J.M., 2018. Existence of equilibrium in large matching markets with complementarities. *working paper*.
- Baldwin, E., Klemperer, P., 2019. Understanding Preferences: “Demand Types”, and the Existence of Equilibrium with Indivisibilities. *Econometrica*, 87, 867-932.

- Bogomolnaia, A., Moulin, H., 2001. A new solution to the random assignment problem. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 100, 295-328.
- Cassels, J. W. S., 1971. An Introduction to the Geometry of Numbers. Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Vol. 99. Berlin-Göttingen-Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag.
- Che, Y-K., Kim, J., Kojima, F., 2019. Stable matching in large economies. *Econometrica*, 87(1), 65-110.
- Danilov, V., Koshevoy, G., 2004. Discrete Convexity and Unimodularity-I. *Advances in Mathematics*, 189(2), 301-324.
- Danilov, V., Koshevoy, G., Murota, K., 2001. Discrete convexity and equilibria in economics with indivisible goods and money. *Mathematical Social Sciences*, 41, 251-273.
- Echenique, F., Oviedo, J., 2004. Core many-to-one matchings by fixed point methods. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 115, 358-376.
- Echenique, F., Oviedo, J., 2006. A theory of stability in many-to-many matching. *Theoretical Economics*, 1, 233-273.
- Echenique, F., Yenmez, B., 2007. A Solution to Matching With Preferences Over Colleagues. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 59, 46-71.
- Fleiner, T., 2001. A fixed-point approach to stable matchings and some applications. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 28, 103-126.
- Gale, D., Shapley, L.S., 1962. College admissions and the stability of marriage. *American Mathematical Monthly*, 69, 9-15.
- Gul, F., Stacchetti, E., 1999. Walrasian equilibrium with gross substitutes. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 87(1), 95-124.
- Hatfield, J.W., Milgrom, P.R., 2005. Matching with contracts. *American Economic Review*, 95, 913-935.

- Kelso, A. S., Crawford, V.P., 1982. Job matching, coalition formation and gross substitutes. *Econometrica*, 50, 1483-1504.
- Klaus, B., Klijn, F., 2005. Stable Matchings and Preferences of Couples. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 121, 75-106.
- Kojima, F., Pathak, P.A., Roth, A.E., 2013. Matching with Couples: Stability and Incentives in Large Markets. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 128, 1585-1632.
- Nguyen, T., Vohra, R., 2018. Near-Feasible Stable Matchings with Couples. *American Economic Review*, 108(11), 3154-3169.
- Ostrovsky, M., 2008. Stability in supply chain networks. *American Economic Review*, 98, 897-923.
- Pycia, M., 2012. Stability and preference alignment in matching and coalition formation. *Econometrica*, 80(1), 323-362.
- Roth, A.E., Peranson, E., 1999. The Redesign of the Matching Market for American Physicians: Some Engineering Aspects of Economic Design. *American Economic Review*, 89, 748-780.
- Roth, A.E., 2002. The Economist as Engineer: Game Theory, Experimentation, and Computation as Tools for Design Economics. *Econometrica*, 70, 1341-1378.
- Roth, A.E., Sotomayor, M., 1990. Two-sided Matching: A Study in Game-Theoretic Modelling and Analysis. *Econometric Society Monographs No. 18*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge England.
- Schrijver, A., 1986. Theory of linear and integer programming. *Wiley-Interscience Series in Discrete Mathematics*, vol. 13, John Wiley & Sons, Chichester, UK.
- Sun, N., Yang, Z., 2006. Equilibria and indivisibilities: Gross substitutes and complements. *Econometrica*, 74, 1385-1402.
- Sun, N., Yang, Z., 2009. A double-track adjustment process for discrete markets with substitutes and complements. *Econometrica*, 77, 993-952.

Tran, N.M., Yu, J., 2019. Product-Mix Auctions and Tropical Geometry. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 44(4), 1145-1509.