

Two-Sided Manipulation Games in Stable Matching Markets

Hadi Hosseini
Penn State University
hadi@psu.edu

Grzegorz Lisowski
AGH University of Science
and Technology
glisowski@agh.edu.pl

Shraddha Pathak
Penn State University
ssp5547@psu.edu

Abstract

The Deferred Acceptance (DA) algorithm is an elegant procedure for finding a stable matching in two-sided matching markets. It ensures that no pair of agents prefers each other to their matched partners. In this work, we initiate the study of two-sided manipulations in matching markets as non-cooperative games. We introduce the *accomplice manipulation game*, where a man misreports to help a specific woman obtain a better partner, whenever possible. We provide a polynomial time algorithm for finding a pure strategy Nash equilibrium (NE) and show that our algorithm always yields a stable matching—although not every Nash equilibrium corresponds to a stable matching. Additionally, we show how our analytical techniques for the accomplice manipulation game can be applied to other manipulation games in matching markets, such as one-for-many and the standard self-manipulation games. We complement our theoretical findings with empirical evaluations of different properties of the resulting NE, such as the welfare of the agents.

1 Introduction

Many real-world markets, from school choice [Abdulkadiroğlu *et al.*, 2005a,0] and resident matching [Roth and Peranson, 1999] to ride-sharing platforms [Banerjee and Johari, 2019] and recommendation systems [Eskandarian and Mobasher, 2020], are inherently markets with two sides. In these markets, there are two disjoint sets of agents, each with preferences over agents on the other side; for example, drivers and passengers in ride-sharing platforms, or prospective students and schools are in two separate sides of the market.¹ In such a scenario, the primary objective is to find a *stable* matching, i.e., a matching in which no pair of agents prefer one another to their matched partners.

The Deferred Acceptance (DA) algorithm [Gale and Shapley, 1962] is a celebrated mechanism that runs in rounds of proposals and rejections to output a stable matching. While DA is strategyproof for the proposing agents (i.e., men) [Dubins and Freedman, 1981; Huang, 2006], it is known to be susceptible to strategic misreporting by the proposed-to side (i.e., women) [Roth and Rothblum, 1999b; Teo *et al.*, 2001]. In fact, not only DA, but all stable matching mechanisms are prone to strategic manipulation [Roth, 1982].

The simplicity of the DA algorithm has prompted studies on the different possible types of manipulations, with a major focus on *one-sided* manipulations, where coalitions of misreporting agents are from the same side of the market [Dubins and Freedman, 1981; Huang, 2006]. Such manipulations are observed in the real world. For instance, drivers on ride-hailing platforms collude to create an artificial shortage, triggering surge pricing. In addition, often the coalition of manipulators contains agents from *both* sides of the market: drivers sometimes collude with passengers by opting for ‘offline rides’ upon arrival. Agents on one side of the market may also indirectly influence the behavior of those on the other side; for instance, drivers influence the behavior of the riders by moving further away [Banerjee and Johari, 2019], or schools influence the behavior of ‘undesirable’ students by appearing less attractive by hiking certain fees or mandating uniforms [Hatfield *et al.*, 2016].

Such examples have motivated the study of coalitions consisting of agents from both sides of the market, i.e., *two-sided* manipulations, in the recent past [Bendlin and Hosseini, 2019; Hosseini *et al.*, 2021,0].

¹For the ease of exposition and consistency with the plethora of work in matching markets, in this paper, we refer to the two disjoint sets of agents as men and women.

Specifically, Bendlin and Hosseini [2019] and Hosseini *et al.* [2021] consider *manipulation via an accomplice* in the DA algorithm where an accomplice man may misreport his preferences to help a specific woman, without harming himself. Or, a man may misreport his preferences to help *all* women on the other side [Hosseini *et al.*, 2022].

These studies focus on finding the *optimal misreport* and understanding their *effect on stability* of the resulting matching. However, they do not consider the potential subsequent strategic incentives that they create or the effect of uncoordinated simultaneous misreports by multiple agents. Such strategic behavior by multiple coalitions of agents gives rise to two-sided manipulations as non-cooperative games in matching markets, raising the questions of whether these games have an equilibrium, and if they do, what their properties are. In the ride-hailing example, although offline rides may initially benefit individual driver-passenger pairs, this advantage encourages more pairs to engage in manipulation, ultimately reducing the ride-hailing company’s profit margins and resulting in higher prices for passengers.

Our Results and Techniques. We initiate the study of two-sided manipulation games by investigating two variants of the problem: *accomplice* manipulation games and *one-for-many* manipulation games. In these games, strategic men misreport their preferences (through *permutation*) to help a strategic woman (or women) receive a better match, without harming themselves. Such pairs of men and women are called ‘strategic pairs’, and a reported preference profile by all strategic men is said to be a (pure strategy) Nash equilibrium (NE) when no such strategic pair can manipulate.

Our first main result (Theorem 1) shows that the accomplice manipulation game always supports a pure strategy NE. Our constructive proof, based on careful construction of the best-response dynamics in the associated game, enables us to devise an algorithm to find an NE in polynomial time. Although not every best-response dynamic converges (Example 1), we show that dynamics consisting of optimal (or even sub-optimal) *push-up* strategies always do. These strategies ensure that the resulting matching in every step of the dynamic lies within the original stable lattice, thereby providing a potential function that guarantees (polynomial time) convergence. This also guarantees that the NE preference profile found by our algorithm results in a stable matching (with respect to the truthful profile) under DA, even though not all NEs correspond to a stable matching. Interestingly, all of them are approximately stable (Theorem 2).

In Section 5, we show how our technique of adroit construction of best-response dynamics can be utilized to find an NE in one-for-all manipulation [Hosseini *et al.*, 2022] and self-manipulation by a woman [Teo *et al.*, 2001]. While the existence of NE was shown previously in woman manipulation games [Roth, 1984; Zhou, 1991; Gupta *et al.*, 2016a], our technique reveals insights into the structure of Nash equilibria and provides a direct construction of polynomial-time algorithms for computing an NE.

In Section 6, we complement our theoretical results with an experimental evaluation of more properties of the NE; namely welfare of agents in NE and length of the best-response dynamic.

All omitted proofs along with additional results can be found in the supplementary material.

Related Literature. The incompatibility of stability and strategy-proofness in two-sided matching markets [Roth, 1982] has led to extensive studies on manipulations of the DA algorithm. The distinctions are based on two factors: the type of misreport—truncating preferences [Roth and Rothblum, 1999a] or permuting preferences [Teo *et al.*, 2001]—and the misreporting agents, whether it is a single agent [Dubins and Freedman, 1981; Teo *et al.*, 2001] or a coalition [Huang, 2006; Shen *et al.*, 2018,0].

Traditionally, the focus on coalitional manipulations has been on coalitions with agents from the same side of the market. Bendlin and Hosseini [2019] and Hosseini *et al.* [2021] initiated the study of coalitions consisting of agents from different sides of the market, and showed that optimal manipulation strategies can be computed in polynomial time for accomplice Hosseini *et al.* [2021] and one-for-all manipulations Hosseini *et al.* [2022].

The study of misreports in DA as non-cooperative games has also predominantly focused on one-sided manipulations. Specifically, Roth [1984] showed that for the single-agent manipulation game by women, every NE results in a stable matching. Furthermore, every NE can be characterized in the following manner: Whenever a stable matching is supported by some preference profile, there also exists an NE that attains this matching [Zhou, 1991]. Since DA on the truthful preference profile results in a stable matching, i.e., there exists a stable matching and a preference profile (truthful) that supports it, the *existence* of a

Nash equilibrium for this game is known. Its computation was later studied by Gupta *et al.* [2016b]. Even for games in which the players are a coalition of women, a strong NE is known to exist, and the resulting matching is unique [Shen *et al.*, 2018].

2 Preliminaries

Stable Matching. A *stable matching* instance $\langle M, W, \succ \rangle$ consists of two disjoint sets of agents, colloquially referred to as *men* (M) and *women* (W) where $|M| = |W| = n$, as well as a *preference profile* \succ that specifies the *preference lists* of all agents. The preference list of an agent i , denoted by \succ_i , is a strict total ordering over agents on the other side. So, we write $m_i \succ_w m_j$ if a woman w prefers man m_i to m_j and $m_i \succeq_w m_j$ if she is indifferent between them or (strictly) prefers m_i to m_j . Similarly, for each man $m \in M$, $w_i \succ_m w_j$ and $w_i \succeq_m w_j$ indicate a strict and weak preference of m for w_i over w_j . Moreover, we write \succ_{-X} to denote the preference profile of all agents apart from the agents in the set X , and thus, $\succ = (\succ_{-X}, \succ_X)$.

A *matching* is a bijective function $\mu : M \cup W \rightarrow M \cup W$, where, for every $m \in M$ and $w \in W$, $\mu(m) \in W$, $\mu(w) \in M$, and $\mu(w) = m$ if and only if $\mu(m) = w$. For a matching μ , a pair of agents $(m, w) \in M \times W$ forms a *blocking pair*, if $w \succ_m \mu(m)$ and $m \succ_w \mu(w)$, i.e., when m and w prefer each other to their matched partners in μ . A matching is said to be *stable* if it does not contain a blocking pair. The set of all stable matchings is denoted by \mathcal{S}_\succ and forms a distributive lattice that is possibly exponential in size [Knuth, 1997].

Given a subset of agents $X \subseteq M \cup W$, for any two matchings μ, μ' we write $\mu \succeq_X \mu'$ if all its members weakly prefer μ over μ' , i.e., $\mu \succeq_i \mu'$ for all $i \in X$. We write $\mu \succ_X \mu'$ when $\mu \succeq_X \mu'$ and at least one agent $j \in X$ strictly prefers μ to μ' , i.e., $\mu \succ_j \mu'$.

The Deferred Acceptance Algorithm. The *deferred acceptance algorithm* (DA) guarantees to find a stable matching μ in a two-phase procedure. First, in the *proposal phase*, each currently unmatched man proposes to his favorite woman who has not rejected him yet. Subsequently, in the *rejection phase*, each woman tentatively accepts her favorite proposal, rejecting the others. The procedure terminates when no more proposals are possible. We denote the outcome of DA under the preference profile \succ by $\mu_\succ := \text{DA}(\succ)$. Gale and Shapley [1962] showed that given any profile \succ the DA algorithm always returns a matching that is stable and *men-optimal*, i.e., for each $\mu' \in \mathcal{S}_\succ$, $\mu_\succ \succeq_M \mu'$. In contrast, DA is *women-pessimal*, i.e., for every $\mu' \in \mathcal{S}_\succ$, $\mu' \succeq_W \mu_\succ$ [McVitie and Wilson, 1971].

One-Sided Strategies. For a profile \succ and the matching $\mu_\succ := \text{DA}(\succ)$, a woman w can *self manipulate* if there is a misreport \succ'_w (a *permutation* of w 's true list \succ_w) such that $\mu_{\succ'} \succ_w \mu_\succ$ where $\mu_{\succ'} := \text{DA}(\succ_{-w}, \succ'_w)$. The self manipulation strategies are *one-sided*, i.e., a manipulator woman misreports to her own benefit. These strategies are known to admit tractable algorithms [Teo *et al.*, 2001; Vaish and Garg, 2017].

Two-Sided Strategies. A manipulation strategy could be *two-sided* involving agents from both sides of the market where an agent from one side (a man) misreports to improve the match of beneficiary agents (a set of women). Formally, given a profile \succ , we say that a woman w can manipulate through an *accomplice* m if $\mu_{\succ'} \succ_w \mu_\succ$ where $\mu_\succ := \text{DA}(\succ)$ and $\mu_{\succ'} := \text{DA}(\succ_{-m}, \succ'_m)$. A generalization of this two-sided strategy is *one-for-many* manipulation where a misreporting agent improves the match of a subset of women. Formally, a strategy is *one-for-many* if, for a set of beneficiary women $P_w \subseteq W$, man m 's misreport \succ'_m is such that $\mu_{\succ'} \succ_{P_w} \mu_\succ$, where $\mu_{\succ'} := \text{DA}(\succ_{-m}, \succ'_m)$ and $\mu_\succ := \text{DA}(\succ)$. These two-sided manipulation strategies were introduced by Hosseini *et al.* [2021] and Hosseini *et al.* [2022].

We say that an accomplice m incurs *regret* if he receives a less preferred match after misreporting, i.e., $\mu_\succ \succ_m \mu_{\succ'}$. Due to the strategyproofness of DA for the men [Dubins and Freedman, 1981], given any misreport \succ'_m , we have $\mu_\succ \succeq_m \mu_{\succ'}$. Thus, a manipulation strategy is *with-regret* if $\mu_{\succ'}(m) \neq \mu_\succ(m)$. Otherwise, man m receives its original outcome and incurs *no-regret*, i.e. $\mu_{\succ'}(m) = \mu_\succ(m)$.

Stability Relaxations. Given a preference profile \succ and a fixed set of pairs $X \subseteq M \times W$, we say that a matching μ is X -stable with respect to \succ if every blocking pair (if one exists) belongs to X . Clearly a stable matching is X -stable, and every matching is X -stable when $X = M \times W$. We note that this relaxation

generalizes the notion of m -stability [Bendlin and Hosseini, 2019]; an m -stable matching is X -stable with $X = \{m\} \times W$. Under accomplice manipulation, any matching that is stable with respect to the manipulated profile \succ' is X -stable with respect to the true profile \succ and the set X is exactly $\{m\} \times W$ [Hosseini *et al.*, 2021].

3 Two-Sided Manipulation Games

Here, we formally define two variants of two-sided manipulation games, namely *accomplice manipulation game* and *one-for-many manipulation game*. Also, we introduce additional operations and theoretical techniques that will be used to analyze these games.

Accomplice Manipulation Game. Given an instance $\langle M, W, \succ \rangle$, the players of the game are given by a set of *strategic pairs*, denoted by $P \subseteq M \times W$. Let P_m be the set of *strategic men*, i.e., $P_m := \{m \in M \mid (m, w) \in P \text{ for some } w \in W\}$, and $P_w := \{w \in W \mid (m, w) \in P \text{ for some } m \in M\}$ represent the set of *strategic women*. Note that pairs in P need not be pairwise disjoint. That is, an agent can be in alliance with multiple individuals but not as a coalition, i.e., there is no coordination among accomplices or beneficiaries.

A *strategy profile* $\mathbf{p} = (\mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_n)$ is a list of *reported* (not necessarily true) total orderings by the accomplices, i.e., the men. We assume that every woman reports her preference list truthfully (\succ_w), and thus, for ease of exposition, we omit their preference list and write $\text{DA}(\mathbf{p})$ to denote the outcome of DA on the preference list of all agents including those who report truthfully.

For a strategy profile \mathbf{p} , an *accomplice manipulation* by a strategic pair $(m, w) \in P$ is a misreported preference \mathbf{p}'_m by a manipulator m , such that, for $\mu_{\mathbf{p}} := \text{DA}(\mathbf{p})$ and $\mu_{\mathbf{p}'} := \text{DA}(\mathbf{p}_{-m}, \mathbf{p}'_m)$, (i) the beneficiary woman w benefits from this misreport, i.e., $\mu_{\mathbf{p}'} \succ_w \mu_{\mathbf{p}}$, and (ii) the manipulator man m does not become worse-off (with respect to his true preferences) from this misreport, i.e., $\mu_{\mathbf{p}'} \succeq_m \mu_{\mathbf{p}}$. Note that in conditions (i) and (ii), the partners in matchings corresponding to the profiles \mathbf{p} and \mathbf{p}' are compared according to the true profile \succ . Such a manipulation is called a *better response* to the profile \mathbf{p} , and it is the *best response* if it provides the best partner for w among all better responses.

For an accomplice manipulation game with strategic pairs $P \subseteq M \times W$, a strategy profile \succ_{NE} is a *Nash Equilibrium* (NE) if there does not exist a strategic pair $(m, w) \in P$, such that (m, w) can perform an accomplice manipulation at the profile \succ_{NE} .

One-for-Many Manipulation Game. Given a strategy profile \mathbf{p} , a *one-for-many manipulation* by a man m for a subset of beneficiary women $P_w^m \subseteq W$ is a misreported preference \mathbf{p}'_m such that, for $\mu_{\mathbf{p}} := \text{DA}(\mathbf{p})$ and $\mu_{\mathbf{p}'} := \text{DA}(\mathbf{p}_{-m}, \mathbf{p}'_m)$, we have that (i) $\mu_{\mathbf{p}'}$ Pareto dominates $\mu_{\mathbf{p}}$ for the set of women P_w^m , i.e., for every $w \in P_w^m$, $\mu_{\mathbf{p}'} \succeq_w \mu_{\mathbf{p}}$ and for some $w' \in P_w^m$, $\mu_{\mathbf{p}'} \succ_{w'} \mu_{\mathbf{p}}$, and (ii) the manipulator man m is not worse-off through this misreport, i.e., $\mu_{\mathbf{p}'} \succeq_m \mu_{\mathbf{p}}$. Such a manipulation \mathbf{p}' is said to be a better response to \mathbf{p} , and it is the best response if no other strategy \mathbf{p}''_m Pareto dominates \mathbf{p}'_m .

Then, in the context of a one-for-all manipulation game with $P_m \subseteq M$ as a set of misreporting men and $\{P_w^m\}_{m \in P_m}$ as the set of beneficiary women, a strategy profile \succ_{NE} is said to be a Nash equilibrium (NE) if there is no misreporting agent $m \in P_m$ such that m can perform a one-for-many strategy at \succ_{NE} .

Push-up Operation. Let \mathbf{p} be a strategy profile (not necessarily \succ) and $\mu_{\mathbf{p}} := \text{DA}(\mathbf{p})$. For any man m , let $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}_m, \mu_{\mathbf{p}})$ and $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p}_m, \mu_{\mathbf{p}})$ denote the set of women m reports above and below his DA(\mathbf{p}) partner in \mathbf{p}_m , i.e., $\mathbf{p}_m = (\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}_m, \mu_{\mathbf{p}}), \mu_{\mathbf{p}}(m), \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p}_m, \mu_{\mathbf{p}}))$. We say that a man m performs a *push-up* operation on a set $X \subseteq W$ if the new list is $\mathbf{p}_m^{X\uparrow} = (\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}_m, \mu_{\mathbf{p}}) \cup X, \mu_{\mathbf{p}}(m), \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p}_m, \mu_{\mathbf{p}}) \setminus X)$; see Figure 1 for a pictorial representation. Note that $\mathbf{p}_m^{X\uparrow}$ does not encode a unique preference order, but every permutation of preferences above or below the DA match provides the same matching [Huang, 2006]. For a more detailed discussion, we refer the reader to Appendix A.

Notably, any accomplice manipulation can be performed through push-up manipulations only (Proposition 1(i)). Also, as long as the manipulator m incurs no-regret, the stable lattice of the manipulated instance consisting of push-up operations is a subset of the original one (Proposition 1(ii)). Thus, each woman gets weakly better-off and each man weakly worse-off from a no-regret accomplice manipulation (Proposition 1(iii)).




Figure 1: Push-up operations by man m in strategy profile \mathbf{p} .

Proposition 1 (Hosseini *et al.* [2021]). *Let \mathbf{p} be a strategy profile. For any accomplice manipulation \mathbf{p}' by accomplice man m such that $\mu_{\mathbf{p}'} := \text{DA}(\mathbf{p}')$, we have the following:*

- (i) \mathbf{p}' can be performed through an inconspicuous push-up operation on \mathbf{p} , i.e., $\mathbf{p}' := (\mathbf{p}_{-m}, \mathbf{p}_m^{X\uparrow})$ where $|X| = 1$.
- (ii) For a $\mathbf{p}' := (\mathbf{p}_{-m}, \mathbf{p}_m^{X\uparrow})$, we have $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{p}'} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{p}}$ as long as m incurs no regret with respect to \mathbf{p} , i.e., $\mu_{\mathbf{p}'} \succeq_m^P \mu_{\mathbf{p}}$.
- (iii) For a $\mathbf{p}' := (\mathbf{p}_{-m}, \mathbf{p}_m^{X\uparrow})$ and its corresponding matching $\mu_{\mathbf{p}'} := \text{DA}(\mathbf{p}')$, if m does not incur regret (i.e., $\mu_{\mathbf{p}'} \succeq_m^P \mu_{\mathbf{p}}$), then $\mu_{\mathbf{p}'} \succ_W^P \mu_{\mathbf{p}}$ and $\mu_{\mathbf{p}} \succ_M^P \mu_{\mathbf{p}'}$.

Here, $\mu_{\mathbf{p}'} \succ_i^P \mu_{\mathbf{p}}$ represents that, in the strategy profile \mathbf{p} , agent i prefers its partner in $\mu_{\mathbf{p}'}$ to its partner in $\mu_{\mathbf{p}}$. Similarly interpret \succ_X^P for the set of agents X .

4 Accomplice Manipulation Games

Here, we consider accomplice manipulation games that may involve *any* subset of strategic pairs. The primary questions are (i) the existence of an NE and (ii) computing an NE (if one exists). Once we address the above questions, we will discuss the properties of an NE including its stability with respect to true preferences and the number of potential equilibria.

First, we highlight a relationship between the NE of two accomplice games. Take two subsets of strategic pairs $P, P' \subseteq M \times W$ such that $P_m = P'_m$ and $P_w \subseteq P'_w$. Proposition 2 implies that the accomplice game with P as strategic pairs have at least as many NE as the game with P' as strategic pairs. Also, finding a NE for the game with $P_m \times W$ as the set of strategic agents suffices to find an NE for any game with $P = (P_m, P_w)$.

Proposition 2. *Consider two sets of strategic pairs $P = (P_m, P_w)$ and $P' = (P'_m, P'_w)$ such that $P_w \subseteq P'_w$ and $P_m = P'_m$. If a strategy profile \mathbf{p} is an NE for the game with P' , then it is also an NE for the game with P .*

A common method to prove that a pure strategy NE always exists for any scenario is to demonstrate that better or best responses do not cycle. This ensures that best (or better) response dynamics converges to an NE. However, for our game, it turns out that such dynamics may not necessarily converge when accomplice agents' strategies consist of *any* misreport; see Example 1 (adapted from [Hosseini *et al.*, 2021]).

Example 1 (Best-response dynamics may not converge). *Consider an instance with five men and five women, with preferences as listed below. Let $P = \{(m_3, w_4), (m_3, w_1)\}$ be the strategic pairs.*

m_1 :	<u>w_2^*</u>	<u>w_1</u>	w_3	w_4	w_5	w_1 :	<u>m_1</u>	m_3	<u>m_2^*</u>	m_4	m_5
m_2 :	<u>w_1^*</u>	<u>w_2</u>	w_3	w_4	w_5	w_2 :	<u>m_2</u>	m_1^*	m_3	m_4	m_5
m_3 :	w_1	<u>w_3^*</u>	w_4	w_2	w_5	w_3 :	<u>m_3^*</u>	m_1	m_2	m_4	m_5
m_4 :	<u>w_4</u>	<u>w_5^*</u>	w_1	w_2	w_3	w_4 :	<u>m_5^*</u>	m_3	m_1	m_2	<u>m_4</u>
m_5 :	<u>w_5</u>	<u>w_4^*</u>	w_1	w_2	w_3	w_5 :	<u>m_4^*</u>	m_1	m_2	m_3	<u>m_5</u>

The DA matching on \succ is underlined. Notice that the strategic profile \succ' where m_3 reports $w_4 \succ' w_3 \succ' w_1 \succ' w_2 \succ' w_5$ and everyone else reports truthfully results in the matching $*$ and is an accomplice manipulation for (m_3, w_4) . However, at \succ' , (m_3, w_1) is an accomplice pair, and \succ is an accomplice manipulation for (m_3, w_4) .

In the above example, notice that \succ' resulted from an operation which was *not* a push-up operation on \succ_{m_3} ; woman w_1 is pushed-down in the preference list \succ'_{m_3} . In fact this is precisely the reason for the cyclic nature of this dynamic. Next, we show that best and better response dynamics consistent with push-up manipulation strategies, defined for any set of strategic pairs $P \subseteq M \times W$, converge in polynomial time, thereby proving the existence of a pure strategy NE.

4.1 Existence and Computation of an NE

Our constructed best (better) response dynamics starts at the truthful preference profile and each successor profile is a result of an optimal (or sub-optimal) push-up accomplice manipulation by some strategic pair $(m, w) \in P$.

Definition 1 (Push-up Dynamics). *For strategic pairs P , a push-up dynamic is a sequence of strategy profiles $\bar{\mathbf{p}} = (\mathbf{p}^{(1)}, \dots)$ starting at $\mathbf{p}^{(1)} = \succ$, where each subsequent profile $\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)}$ results from a no-regret, push-up accomplice manipulation by some strategic pair $(m, w) \in P$ at $\mathbf{p}^{(t)}$, if possible. Otherwise, $\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)} = \mathbf{p}^{(t)}$ and we say that the push-up dynamic converges with $\mathbf{p}^{(t)}$ as its fixed-point.*

Using this best-response dynamic, we show that we can efficiently find an NE, as stated below.

Theorem 1 (Existence of an NE). *For every accomplice manipulation game defined by a set of strategic players $P \subseteq M \times W$, there exists a polynomially computable NE.*

Notice that in the push-up dynamic every subsequent manipulation is with respect to the current profiles. This ensures that, if the dynamic converges, then no push-up accomplice manipulations can be performed on the fixed point (manipulations via other operations may still be possible). To show the existence and efficient computation of an NE for the accomplice game we need to show the following two properties of the push-up dynamics: (i) it always converges in polynomial time, and (ii) its fixed point does not allow for *any* (not just push-up) accomplice manipulation by the strategic pairs.

For showing the convergence of the push-up dynamics, we prove that as we move along the dynamic sequence, (i) the set of stable solutions shrinks, and (ii) for any man m , the set of women preferred lower than m 's partner in matching $\mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)}}$ in $\mathbf{p}_m^{(t+1)}$ is a subset of the set of women preferred lower than m 's partner in the same matching but in the preference profile $\mathbf{p}_m^{(t)}$.

Lemma 1. *In the push-up dynamics, the following set inclusions hold for each man m :*

- (i) $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)}} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}} \subseteq \dots \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{p}^{(1)}} = \mathcal{S}_{\succ}$, and
- (ii) $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p}_m^{(t+1)}, \mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)}}) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p}_m^{(t)}, \mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}}) \subseteq \dots \subseteq \mathcal{R}(\succ_m, \mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)}})$.

Notice that part (ii) of Lemma 1 implies that if we perform a manipulation at $\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)}$ and the manipulation is such that $\mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}} \succ_m^{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}} \mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)}}$ for the manipulator m , i.e., $\mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)}}(m) \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p}_m^{(t+1)}, \mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}})$, then $\mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}} \succ_m \mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)}}$. That is, the manipulation was with-regret since m became worse-off. So, in the push-up dynamics, it never happens that $\mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}} \succ_m^{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}} \mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)}}$.

Lemma 2. *In the push-up dynamics, if $\mathbf{p}^{(t)} \neq \mathbf{p}^{(t+1)}$, then $\mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)}} \succeq_m^{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}} \mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}}$.*

This implies that computing an accomplice manipulation at $\mathbf{p}^{(t)}$ reduces to finding a push-up manipulation in the instance $\langle M, W, (\succ_{-S_m}, \mathbf{p}^{(t)}) \rangle$. With this, we can show that the push-up dynamic converges.

Lemma 3 (Push-up dynamics always converge). *For every accomplice manipulation game defined by the set of strategic players $P \subseteq M \times W$, the push-up dynamics always converge in a polynomial number of steps.*

Proof. If $\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)} \neq \mathbf{p}^{(t)}$, then there is some accomplice pair $(m, w) \in P$ who can perform a push-up manipulation at $\mathbf{p}^{(t)}$. By Lemma 2, this means that the pair (m, w) can no-regret accomplice manipulate in the instance $\langle M, W, \mathbf{p}^{(t)} \rangle$. Then, by Proposition 1, $\mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)}} \succ_W^{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}} \mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}}$. As in the push-up dynamics of accomplice manipulations women do not change their preference profiles, $\succ_W^{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}} = \succ_W$ for every i in the sequence. Hence, by a potential argument, the set of women can be better-off with respect to \succ at most n times. Thus, at some point $\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)} = \mathbf{p}^{(t)}$. Note that at every step i in which $\mathbf{p}_{i+1} \neq \mathbf{p}^{(t)}$, at least one woman gets strictly better-off. As an individual woman can improve her matching at most n times, the sequence converges by the step $i \leq n^2$. \square

As the push-up dynamics always converge, to prove that the fixed point \mathbf{p}^* is an NE, it remains to show that no accomplice manipulation (not just push-up) is possible at \mathbf{p}^* .

Proof of Theorem 1. By Lemma 3, the push-up dynamic converges, i.e., $\mathbf{p}^{(t)} = \mathbf{p}^{(t+1)}$. When $\mathbf{p}^{(t)} = \mathbf{p}^{(t+1)}$, $\mathbf{p}^{(t)}$ is a fixed point and there is no strategic pair $(m, w) \in P$ who can perform a push-up accomplice manipulation. So, if the converged point $\mathbf{p}^{(t)}$ is not an NE, then some pair $(m, w) \in P$ can perform an accomplice manipulation at $\mathbf{p}^{(t)}$ via an operation which is not push-up. Let the manipulated strategy profile be \mathbf{p}' . As it is a no-regret manipulation, $\mu_{\mathbf{p}'} \succeq_m \mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}}$, i.e., $\mu_{\mathbf{p}'} \notin \mathcal{R}(\succ_m, \mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}})$. From this and Lemma 1, we have that $\mu_{\mathbf{p}'} \notin \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p}_m^{(t)}, \mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}})$, i.e., $\mu_{\mathbf{p}'} \succeq_m^{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}} \mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}}$. So, if we consider the instance $\langle M, W, \mathbf{p}^{(t)} \rangle$, then the manipulation \mathbf{p}' is an accomplice manipulation on this instance. But, by Proposition 1, if m can manipulate through an operation which is not push-up, then he can also manipulate through an inconspicuous push-up operation. But, as $\mathbf{p}^{(t)}$ is a fixed point, no (no-regret) push-up manipulations are possible. So, $\mathbf{p}^{(t)}$ is an NE. Also, as the sequence converges in at most n^2 steps and finding a successor in the sequence is polynomial-time solvable (as shown in Appendix B), an NE can be found in polynomial-time. \square

4.2 Properties of NE

Here, we discuss several properties of NE in the accomplice manipulation game.

Stability. Given the existence of an NE in accomplice manipulation games, a natural question is to ask whether, for every NE profile \succ_{NE} , the matching $\text{DA}(\succ_{\text{NE}})$ is stable with respect to true preferences. We address this question by showing that (i) the NE constructed in Section 4.1 through the push-up dynamics results in a stable matching, and (ii) while all equilibria do not necessarily correspond to a stable matching, every NE is X -stable, for $X = (M \times W) \setminus P$.

Theorem 2. (Stability of Nash Equilibria) *For an accomplice manipulation game with $P \subseteq M \times W$:*

- (i) *The matching corresponding to the NE profile constructed from the push-up dynamic is stable.*
- (ii) *Some NE profiles result in an unstable matching with respect to true preferences. However, every matching corresponding to an NE profile is $((M \times W) \setminus P)$ -stable.*

Thus, when $P = M \times W$, every NE results in a stable matching under DA.

Proof. From Theorem 1, the push-up dynamics converges to an NE. By Lemma 1, the set of stable matchings at each step of the dynamics satisfies:

$$\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{p}^{(t-1)}} \dots \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{p}^{(1)}} = \mathcal{S}_{\succ}.$$

Let $\mathbf{p}^{(t)}$ be the fixed point of the dynamic. The corresponding matching $\mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}} = \text{DA}(\mathbf{p}_i, \succ_{-P_m})$ belongs to the set $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}}$. From the containment property of the set of stable solutions, $\mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}} \in \mathcal{S}_{\succ}$. The claim follows.

For the second part, to show that some NE profiles result in an unstable matching, consider the instance in Example 1 with strategic pairs $P = \{(m_3, w_4)\}$. Notice that the profile $\succ' = (\succ_{-m_3}, \succ'_{m_3})$ is an NE, but the resulting matching $\mu_{\succ'} = \text{DA}(\succ')$ (marked by *) is unstable since (m_3, w_1) forms a blocking pair.

Proof of $((M \times W) \setminus P)$ -stability: Let \succ_{NE} be a NE profile for the accomplice game with the strategic pairs $P \subseteq M \times W$, and let its corresponding matching be $\mu_{\succ_{\text{NE}}} = \text{DA}(\succ_{\text{NE}})$. Assume, for contradiction, that $(m, w) \in P$ is a blocking pair in $\mu_{\succ_{\text{NE}}}$. Consider the modified preference profile $\succ' = (\succ_{\text{NE}-m}, \succ'_m)$ where m 's preferences are modified to place w at the top, i.e. $\succ'_m = (w, \dots)$. In $\mu_{\succ'} = \text{DA}(\succ')$, m is matched to w ; that is, through the misreport \succ'_m , m incurs no-regret and w benefits from the misreport, i.e. \succ' is an accomplice manipulation at \succ_{NE} . This contradicts the assumption that μ_{NE} is an NE. \square

The loss in stability in NE can also be measured through the price of anarchy and the price of stability for the accomplice game; details of this can be found in Appendix B.

Number of NE. Theorem 1 showed that every accomplice manipulation game admits at least one pure strategy NE. This raises the question about whether an accomplice game corresponding to an instance admits a unique NE. In fact, we show that the number of NE may indeed be factorially many.

Proposition 3. *Accomplice manipulation games may admit factorially many Nash equilibria.*

Proof. Take a preference profile in which, for every $i < n$, m_i 's most preferred woman is w_i and w_i 's most preferred man is m_i . Also, let $P = \{(m_n, w_n)\}$. Here, since the matching does not depend on m_n 's ranking, every strategy profile (corresponding to different rankings submitted by m_n) is an NE. So, there are $n!$ many NEs in this game. \square

While in the example above all NE strategy profiles lead to the same matching, it is not always the case. For instance, in the example for the proof of Theorem 2 (ii), we show that an NE may correspond to an unstable matching but one resulting in a stable matching always exists. In fact, as we show in the next remark, we can also find NE profiles that correspond to different *stable matchings*, and which can be obtained through different realizations of our push-up dynamics.

Proposition 4. *For an accomplice manipulation game with the set of strategic pairs P , different realizations of the push-up dynamics may result in different NE, each corresponding to a distinct stable matching.*

An example of such an instance was computer-generated and is provided in Appendix B. This example also shows that, during the sequential misreports, some strategic pairs who did not have an incentive to misreport in the truthful profile may benefit from misreporting down the line.

5 Beyond Accomplice Manipulation Games

We previously established the existence and computational tractability of finding an NE for the accomplice manipulation game through the construction a best-response dynamic (push-up dynamics) that converges to an NE. In this section we show that our approach can be applied to simplify the analysis of other strategic games, specifically, one-for-many and woman self-manipulation game.

5.1 One-for-Many Manipulation Games

For every one-for-many manipulation game with strategic agents $P = (P_m, \{P_w^m\}_m)$, we establish the following relation between the set of Nash equilibria of this game and an accomplice manipulation game with an appropriately defined strategic pairs P' (where $P' \neq P$).

Theorem 3. *For a one-for-many game with $(P_m, \{P_w^m\}_m)$ as the set of strategic players, consider an accomplice manipulation game in which the strategic players are defined as follows: $P' = \{(m, w) \mid m \in P_m \text{ and } w \in P_w^m\}$. Then, every NE profile \succ_{NE} of the accomplice game is also an NE profile of the one-for-many manipulation game.*

So, to find an NE for the one-for-many game, it is enough to find an NE for its corresponding accomplice game. From Section 4, since this can be done through its push-up dynamics, the same response dynamics also gives the NE solution for the one-for-many game.


Corollary 1. *Consider a one-for-many manipulation game defined on the strategic men P_m with $\{P_w^m\}_m$ as their corresponding beneficiaries. An NE profile for this game can be computed in polynomial time. Furthermore, at least one of the NE profiles results in a stable matching under DA.*

5.2 Woman Self-Manipulation Games


As before, we construct a best-response dynamic which, when it converges, finds an NE of the woman self-manipulation game (see Appendix C for the definition).

Inconspicuous Dynamics. For strategic women P_w , an inconspicuous dynamic starting at $\mathbf{p}^{(1)} = \succ$ is a sequence of strategy profiles $\bar{\mathbf{p}} = (\mathbf{p}^{(1)}, \dots)$, where each subsequent profile $\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)}$ results from an optimal inconspicuous² self-manipulation by some strategic woman $w \in P_w$ in the matching instance $\langle M, W, \mathbf{p}^{(t)} \rangle$, if possible. Else, $\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)} = \mathbf{p}^{(t)}$.


²A strategy \mathbf{p}'_w for a misreporting woman w is said to be *inconspicuous* to \mathbf{p}_w if it can be derived from \mathbf{p}_w by promoting at most one man and making no other changes to it.



(a) Net welfare: Accomplice and woman self-manipulation games



(b) Accomplice game: Gain for best-off woman.



(c) Self-manipulation game: Gain for best-off woman.

Figure 2: Welfare of agents in NE of accomplice manipulation and woman self-manipulation games as a function of the instance size n and the dispersion parameters (ϕ_w, ϕ_m) in the Mallows' model.

Notice the difference between this dynamics and the push-up dynamics for the accomplice game: The push-up dynamics consisted of no-regret, push-up manipulations, and we showed that finding such a strategy at each step $\mathbf{p}^{(t)}$ was the same as finding a push-up manipulation in the instance $\langle M, W, \mathbf{p}^{(t)} \rangle$. In contrast, the inconspicuous dynamic directly assumes that $\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)}$ is obtained by finding an inconspicuous manipulation in $\langle M, W, \mathbf{p}^{(t)} \rangle$. We show that the inconspicuous dynamic converges to an NE.

Theorem 4. (NE of woman self-manipulation game) *For a woman manipulation game with strategic women $P_w \subseteq W$, the inconspicuous dynamics converges in polynomial time. Moreover, the converged point is an NE.*

The proof is analogous to the one for accomplice manipulation game, and is deferred to Appendix C.

6 Experimental Results

While we theoretically showed the existence of a pure strategy NE and some of its properties, several questions remain open about its convergence in large-scale applications. We investigate two properties:

- (i) *Length of dynamics.* This is interesting since the length of these sequences can be viewed as a proxy for the complexity of the games, especially in practice. So, in reality, can agents reach an NE ‘naturally’ through best-response actions?
- (ii) *Welfare of agents in an NE.* Since the constructed NE is stable and the set of stable matchings forms a lattice, women receive better partners in NE as compared to the truthful matching and men receive worse partners. But how large is their respective gain or loss?

For each of the above two properties, we study the effect of (a) the instance size, and (b) population as defined by correlation between preferences. Instance sizes are measured by n , i.e., the number of men/women. We measure the correlation between preferences using *Mallows' model* which is characterized by *central ranking* u , and a *dispersion parameter* $\phi \in [0, 1]$ Mallows [1957]. Here, the probability of selecting a ranking v is proportional to $\phi^{\text{dist}(u,v)}$, where $\text{dist}(u, v)$ is the minimum number of pairwise swaps required to transform u to v . The parameter ϕ determines the correlation between the preferences; $\phi = 0$ corresponds to unanimity to u and $\phi = 1$ to impartial culture. Mallows' model has been previously studied in the context of matchings [Brilliantova and Hosseini, 2022; Levy, 2017].

Length of Dynamics. To measure the impact of instance size, we generate 500 instances corresponding to each n in $\{5, 10, 15, \dots, 50\}$ using impartial culture.³ We observe that the average and the maximum length (across samples) (i) increase with n , (ii) are larger for the woman self-manipulation game than the accomplice game, and (iii) are relatively small even for large n for both games, indicating that these games are not very complex.

³Several works in stable matchings use IC to generate preferences Ashlagi *et al.* [2017]; Pittel [1989].

To evaluate the effect of correlated preferences, we generate our instances of size $n = 30$, and dispersion parameters ϕ_m, ϕ_w (for men and women respectively) ranging $\{0, 0.2, \dots, 1\}$. For each pair (ϕ_m, ϕ_w) , we generate 500 instances by: (i) uniformly sampling central rankings u_m and u_w for men and women, and (ii) generating n samples each from u_m, u_w and their corresponding ϕ_m, ϕ_w using Mallows’ model. This generates a preference profile for both groups.

For both games, we see that (i) for $\phi_m = \phi_w$, the average length increases with ϕ_m , and (ii) instances in which ϕ_m and ϕ_w are close to each other have larger average lengths. The plots of these experiments, and a similar evaluation of the maximum length are provided in Appendix D.

Welfare of Agents in NE. The instances for the two experiments (impact of instance size and impact of correlated preferences) are generated as before. The net gain (loss) for a woman (man) is measured as the increase (decrease) in the ranking of her (his) partner in the NE matching as compared to the truthful matching.

We observe that, for both the games, the average gain for women and the average loss for men in NE, as well as the gain for the best-off woman and the loss for the worst-off man, increases with n . Surprisingly, however, the loss of the men is larger than the gain for the women, i.e. the net welfare (for men and women together) is negative and decreases with n ; see Figure 2a. Note that this observation addresses an important gap of how strategic behavior impacts welfare of agents in stable matching [Hosseini and Pathak, 2024].

In our experiments for the impact of correlated preferences, we observe that the average gain for women and the gain for the best-off woman increase with the increase in either of the dispersion parameters for the accomplice manipulation game. Surprisingly, however, while the average gain in the woman self-manipulation game increases with ϕ_m , it is the largest for when $\phi_w \sim \phi_m$. Moreover, we observe that the largest gain for the best-off woman occurs in instances with a high correlation in men’s rankings but low correlation in women’s preferences. Also, for smaller values of (ϕ_m, ϕ_w) , the average gain as well as the gain of the best-off woman is significantly higher for the woman self-manipulation game as compared to the accomplice manipulation game. These results are presented in Figure 2 and in Appendix D.

7 Conclusion and Future Work

This work develops a technique that establishes the existence and polynomial time computation of accomplice manipulation and one-for-many manipulation games in two-sided matching markets. Specifically, we carefully construct a best-response dynamic—starting at the truthful profile—that converges to a Nash equilibrium. An interesting future direction would be to study the convergence of such dynamics starting from non-truthful profiles. Other future directions include understanding properties of mixed strategy NE in these games, as well as studying scenarios in which agents not only choose their misreports but also whether to engage in self-manipulation or manipulation through an accomplice.

Acknowledgments

This project has received partial funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No 101002854), and was supported in part by NSF Awards IIS-2144413 and IIS-2107173.



References

- Atila Abdulkadiroğlu, Parag A Pathak, and Alvin E Roth. The New York City High School Match. *American Economic Review*, 95(2):364–367, 2005.
- Atila Abdulkadiroğlu, Parag A Pathak, Alvin E Roth, and Tayfun Sönmez. The Boston Public School Match. *American Economic Review*, 95(2):368–371, 2005.
- Itai Ashlagi, Yash Kanoria, and Jacob D Leshno. Unbalanced random matching markets: The stark effect of competition. *Journal of Political Economy*, 125(1):69–98, 2017.
- Siddhartha Banerjee and Ramesh Johari. Ride Sharing. In *Sharing Economy*, pages 73–97. Springer, 2019.
- Theodora Bendlin and Hadi Hosseini. Partners in Crime: Manipulating the Deferred Acceptance Algorithm through an Accomplice. In *Proceedings of the 33rd AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 9917–9918, 2019.
- Angelina Brilliantova and Hadi Hosseini. Fair stable matching meets correlated preferences. In *Proceedings of the 21st International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems*, pages 190–198, 2022.
- Lester E Dubins and David A Freedman. Machiavelli and the Gale-Shapley algorithm. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 88(7):485–494, 1981.
- Farzad Eskandarian and Bamshad Mobasher. Using stable matching to optimize the balance between accuracy and diversity in recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM Conference on User Modeling, Adaptation and Personalization*, pages 71–79, 2020.
- David Gale and Lloyd S Shapley. College admissions and the stability of marriage. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 69(1):9–15, 1962.
- Sushmita Gupta, Kazuo Iwama, and Shuichi Miyazaki. Total stability in stable matching games. In *15th Scandinavian Symposium and Workshops on Algorithm Theory (SWAT 2016)*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2016.
- Sushmita Gupta, Kazuo Iwama, and Shuichi Miyazaki. Total Stability in Stable Matching Games. In *Proceedings of the 15th Scandinavian Symposium and Workshops on Algorithm Theory*, pages 23:1–23:12, 2016.
- John William Hatfield, Fuhito Kojima, and Yusuke Narita. Improving Schools through School Choice: A Market Design Approach. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 166:186–211, 2016.
- Hadi Hosseini and Shraddha Pathak. Strategic aspects of stable matching markets: A survey. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Third International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI-24)*, 2024.
- Hadi Hosseini, Fatima Umar, and Rohit Vaish. Accomplice Manipulation of the Deferred Acceptance Algorithm. In *Proceedings of the 30th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 231–237, 2021.
- Hadi Hosseini, Fatima Umar, and Rohit Vaish. Two for one & one for all: Two-sided manipulation in matching markets. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-First International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 321–327, 7 2022.
- Chien-Chung Huang. Cheating by men in the gale-shapley stable matching algorithm. In *European Symposium on Algorithms*, pages 418–431. Springer, 2006.
- Donald Knuth. *Stable Marriage and its Relation to Other Combinatorial Problems: An Introduction to the Mathematical Analysis of Algorithms*, volume 10. American Mathematical Society, 1997.
- Avi William Levy. *Novel uses of the Mallows model in coloring and matching*. PhD thesis, 2017.
- Colin L Mallows. Non-null ranking models. i. *Biometrika*, 44(1/2):114–130, 1957.

- David G McVitie and Leslie B Wilson. The stable marriage problem. *Communications of the ACM*, 14(7):486–490, 1971.
- Boris Pittel. The average number of stable matchings. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 2(4):530–549, 1989.
- Alvin E Roth and Elliott Peranson. The redesign of the matching market for american physicians: Some engineering aspects of economic design. *American economic review*, 89(4):748–780, 1999.
- Alvin E Roth and Uriel G Rothblum. Truncation Strategies in Matching Markets—In Search of Advice for Participants. *Econometrica*, 67(1):21–43, 1999.
- Alvin E Roth and Uriel G Rothblum. Truncation strategies in matching markets—in search of advice for participants. *Econometrica*, 67(1):21–43, 1999.
- Alvin E Roth. The economics of matching: Stability and incentives. *Mathematics of operations research*, 7(4):617–628, 1982.
- Alvin E Roth. Misrepresentation and stability in the marriage problem. *Journal of Economic theory*, 34(2):383–387, 1984.
- Weiran Shen, Pingzhong Tang, and Yuan Deng. Coalition manipulation of gale-shapley algorithm. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 32, 2018.
- Weiran Shen, Yuan Deng, and Pingzhong Tang. Coalitional permutation manipulations in the gale-shapley algorithm. *Artificial Intelligence*, 301:103577, 2021.
- Chung-Piaw Teo, Jay Sethuraman, and Wee-Peng Tan. Gale-shapley stable marriage problem revisited: Strategic issues and applications. *Management Science*, 47(9):1252–1267, 2001.
- Rohit Vaish and Dinesh Garg. Manipulating gale-shapley algorithm: Preserving stability and remaining inconspicuous. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 437–443, 2017.
- Lin Zhou. Stable matchings and equilibrium outcomes of the gale-shapley’s algorithm for the marriage problem. *Economics Letters*, 36(1):25–29, 1991.

A Omitted Material from Section 2

Here, we illustrate the notion of a push-up operation. The axis in the figure represents the preference list of the man m in the profile \mathbf{p} , while $\mu_{\mathbf{p}}(m)$ is his match under profile \mathbf{p} . Hence, $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p}_m, \mu_{\mathbf{p}})$ is the set of women that are less preferred than $\mu_{\mathbf{p}}(m)$ in \mathbf{p}_m , and symmetrically $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}_m, \mu_{\mathbf{p}})$ is the set of those women who are more preferred than $\mu_{\mathbf{p}}(m)$ in \mathbf{p}_m . Then, the man m revises his preference list by shifting a set of women X above his match $\mu_{\mathbf{p}}(m)$ in the profile \mathbf{p} .




Figure 3: Illustrating push-up operations by man m in strategy profile \mathbf{p} .

In fact, $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}_m, \mu_{\mathbf{p}})$ and $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p}_m, \mu_{\mathbf{p}})$ can be generalized to $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}'_m, \mu_{\mathbf{p}})$ and $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p}'_m, \mu_{\mathbf{p}})$. Here, the axis represents the preference list of m in profile \mathbf{p}' . As before, $\mu_{\mathbf{p}}(m)$ is m 's match under profile \mathbf{p} , and $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p}'_m, \mu_{\mathbf{p}})$ is the set of less-preferred women than $\mu_{\mathbf{p}}(m)$ in the profile \mathbf{p}'_m and $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}'_m, \mu_{\mathbf{p}})$ is the set of those women who are more preferred than $\mu_{\mathbf{p}}(m)$ in \mathbf{p}'_m .




Figure 4: Illustrating the notation $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}'_m, \mu_{\mathbf{p}})$ and $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p}'_m, \mu_{\mathbf{p}})$.

B Omitted Material from Section 4

B.1 From Section 4.1

Proposition 5. [Gale and Shapley [1962]; McVitie and Wilson [1971]] Given any preference profile \succ , let $\mu_{\succ} := \text{DA}(\succ)$. Then, for any stable matching $\mu' \in \mathcal{S}_{\succ}$, $\mu_{\succ} \succeq_M \mu'$ and $\mu' \succeq_W \mu_{\succ}$.

Proposition 2. Consider two sets of strategic pairs $P = (P_m, P_w)$ and $P' = (P'_m, P'_w)$ such that $P_w \subseteq P'_w$ and $P_m = P'_m$. If a strategy profile \mathbf{p} is an NE for the game with P' , then it is also an NE for the game with P .

Proof. First, notice that since the set of manipulating men in P and P' is the same, every strategy profile in P is also a strategy profile in P' , and vice versa.

Now, towards a contradiction, suppose that there is a strategy profile \mathbf{p} that is a Nash equilibrium in the accomplice game with strategic pairs P' but is not a Nash equilibrium in the game with strategic pairs P . This means that there exists a pair $(m, w) \in P$ that can perform a valid accomplice manipulation (let the manipulated profile be \mathbf{p}') at \mathbf{p} . Since $P_w \subseteq P'_w$, the pair (m, w) is also a strategic pair in the game defined by the pairs P' , i.e., $(m, w) \in P'$. However, this means that \mathbf{p}' is a valid accomplice manipulation in the game defined by the strategic pairs P' as well; this contradicts our assumption and completes the proof. \square

Lemma 1. In the push-up dynamics, the following set inclusions hold for each man m :

- (i) $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)}} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}} \subseteq \dots \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{p}^{(1)}} = \mathcal{S}_{\succ}$, and
- (ii) $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p}_m^{(t+1)}, \mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)}}) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p}_m^{(t)}, \mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}}) \subseteq \dots \subseteq \mathcal{R}(\succ_m, \mu_{\mathbf{p}})$.

Proof. The proof is via induction; in fact we will prove a stronger containment for (ii): $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p}_m^{(t+1)}, w) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p}_m^{(t)}, w) \subseteq \dots \subseteq \mathcal{R}(\succ_m, w)$ for every $w \in \{\mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)}}(m)\} \cup \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p}_m^{(t+1)}, \mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)}})$. Consider the base case ($i = 1$) in which the consecutive strategy profiles are $\mathbf{p}^{(1)} = \succ$ and $\mathbf{p}^{(2)}$ which results from a push-up accomplice manipulation by a pair (m', w') on \succ . Since it is a no-regret, push-up accomplice manipulation, m' does not become worse-off, i.e., $\mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(2)}} \succeq_{m'} \mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(1)}}$. Thus, for the manipulator m' , we have $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p}_{m'}^{(2)}, \mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(2)}}) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p}_{m'}^{(1)}, \mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(2)}})$. For any woman $w \in \mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(2)}}$, we also know that $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p}_{m'}^{(2)}, w) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p}_{m'}^{(1)}, w)$ for every woman $w \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p}_{m'}^{(2)}, \mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(2)}})$ since the manipulation was through a push-up operation. Then, from Proposition 1, we have $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{p}^{(2)}} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{p}^{(1)}}$. Since the preference list of any man $m \neq m'$ has not changed, we have $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p}_m^{(2)}, w) = \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p}_m^{(1)}, w)$. This shows that the set inclusions hold for the base case.

Next, assume that

(i) $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{p}^{(t-1)}} \subseteq \dots \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{p}^{(1)}} = \mathcal{S}_{\succ}$, and

(ii) $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p}_m^{(t)}, w) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p}_m^{(t-1)}, w) \subseteq \dots \subseteq \mathcal{R}(\succ_m, w)$ for every woman $w \in \{\mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}}\} \cup \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p}_m^{(t)}, \mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}})$

and consider a push-up accomplice manipulation by (m'', w'') at $\mathbf{p}^{(t)}$, which leads to the profile $\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)}$. For the manipulator man m'' , since the manipulation is no-regret and via push-up operations at $\mathbf{p}^{(t)}$, we have that $\mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)}} \succeq_{m''} \mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}}$, i.e., $\mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)}} \notin \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p}_{m''}^{(t)}, \mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}})$. By the set inclusions (ii) in the inductive argument, we know that $\mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)}} \notin \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p}_{m''}^{(t)}, \mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}})$, i.e., $\mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)}} \succeq_{m''} \mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}}$. Since this was a no-regret push-up manipulation at $\mathbf{p}^{(t)}$, by applying Proposition 1 to the stable matching instance $\langle M, W, \mathbf{p}^{(t)} \rangle$, we get that $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)}} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}}$, and from the inductive argument, we have $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)}} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}} \subseteq \dots \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{\succ}$; this proves part (i).

For part (ii), from Proposition 1, we know $\mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)}} \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}}$; thus $\mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}} \succ_M^{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}} \mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)}}$, i.e., $\mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)}} \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p}_m^{(t)}, \mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}})$ [whereby $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p}_m^{(t+1)}, \mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)}}) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p}_m^{(t)}, \mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)}})$ and $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p}_m^{(t+1)}, w) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p}_m^{(t)}, w \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p}_m^{(t+1)}, w))$ for every woman $w \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p}_m^{(t+1)}, \mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)}})$]. Thus, from the induction hypothesis, $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p}_m^{(t)}, \mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)}}) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p}_m^{(t-1)}, \mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)}}) \subseteq \dots \subseteq \mathcal{R}(\succ_m, \mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)}})$. Moreover, every woman $w \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p}_m^{(t+1)}, \mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)}})$ also belongs to $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p}_m^{(t)}, \mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)}})$. This completes the proof. \square

For the manipulator m'' , no regret so $\mu_{\mathbf{p}^{t+1}} = \mu_{\mathbf{p}^t}$. Thus, since push-up, we know $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p}_m^{(t+1)}, \mu_{\mathbf{p}^{t+1}}) \subseteq \dots$

Lemma 2. *In the push-up dynamics, if $\mathbf{p}^{(t)} \neq \mathbf{p}^{(t+1)}$, then $\mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)}} \succeq_m^{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}} \mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}}$.*

Proof. Towards a contradiction, assume that $\mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}} \succ_m^{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}} \mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)}}$ for some man m . This means that $\mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)}}(m) \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p}_m^{(t+1)}, \mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}})$. By the set inclusions in Lemma 1 (ii), we get that $\mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)}}(m) \in \mathcal{R}(\succ_m, \mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}})$, i.e., $\mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}} \succ_m \mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)}}$. But this contradicts the construction of the push-up dynamics, which ensures that the manipulation is no-regret. Specifically, it contradicts condition (ii) which states that $\mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)}} \succeq_m \mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}}$. \square

For completing the proof of Theorem 1, we need the following final proposition due to Huang [2006].

Proposition 6. [Huang, 2006]. *For a preference profile \succ and its corresponding DA matching μ_{\succ} , consider $\succ'_m := (\pi(\mathcal{L}(\succ_m, \mu_{\succ})), \mu_{\succ}(m), \pi(\mathcal{R}(\succ_m, \mu_m)))$ where $\pi(\mathcal{L}(\succ_m, \mu_{\succ}))$ and $\pi(\mathcal{R}(\succ_m, \mu_{\succ}))$ are arbitrary permutations of $\mathcal{L}(\succ_m, \mu_{\succ})$ and $\mathcal{R}(\succ_m, \mu_{\succ})$ respectively. Then for $\succ' := (\succ_{-m}, \succ'_m)$ and $\mu_{\succ'} := \text{DA}(\succ')$, we have that $\mu_{\succ} = \mu_{\succ'}$.*

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1.

Proof of Theorem 1

Proof. Here, we describe the remaining part of the proof, i.e., a polynomial-time procedure for checking if \mathbf{p} is an NE. Towards this, consider the stable matching instance $\langle M, W, \mathbf{p} \rangle$, and recall from Proposition 1, if there exists an accomplice pair (m, w) in this instance, then (m, w) can manipulate inconspicuously with respect to \mathbf{p} . For each pair $(m, w) \in P$, consider every possible inconspicuous operation, i.e., all scenarios in which different women from $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p}_m, \mu_{\mathbf{p}})$ are shifted to the first place in m 's ranking (only pushing-up to first place suffices due to Proposition 6). There are at most $O(n)$ such modified instances, and by running DA on every such modified instance, we can check in polynomial time if w benefits from such an operation and if m

incurs any regret with respect to the true preference \succ_m , i.e, check if the modified instance is an accomplice manipulation. If such an inconspicuous operation exists for some $(m, w) \in P$, then we conclude that \mathbf{p} is not an NE; otherwise, since $\mathbf{p}_w = \succ_w$, by definition \mathbf{p} is an NE. Note that our procedure only requires $O(n|P_m|)$ runs of the DA algorithm. Thus, the verification procedure runs in polynomial time. \square

B.2 From Section 4.2

The loss-in-stability due to strategic behavior can be measured in terms of the *Price of Anarchy* and *Price of Stability*, which are defined in terms of the number of stable pairs in a matching μ , denoted $\text{NSP}(\mu)$. A pair (m, w) is said to be stable in a matching μ if it does not block μ .

Definition 2 (Price of Anarchy and Price of Stability). *In an accomplice manipulation game with $P \subseteq M \times W$ as the strategic pairs, the Price of Anarchy (POA) and the Price of Stability (POS) are given by*

$$\text{POA} = \frac{\max_{\text{any } \mu} \text{NSP}(\mu)}{\min_{\mu \in \text{NE}} \text{NSP}(\mu)} = \frac{n^2}{\min_{\mu \in \text{NE}} \text{NSP}(\mu)},$$

$$\text{POS} = \frac{\max_{\text{any } \mu} \text{NSP}(\mu)}{\max_{\mu \in \text{NE}} \text{NSP}(\mu)} = \frac{n^2}{\max_{\mu \in \text{NE}} \text{NSP}(\mu)}.$$

Here, $\text{NSP}(\mu)$ denotes the number of stable (or non-blocking) pairs in matching μ .

Next, we determine the Price of Anarchy and Price of Stability of the accomplice manipulation games.

Theorem 5 (POA and POS of accomplice manipulation games). *For the accomplice manipulation game defined by the strategic pairs $P \subseteq M \times W$, the Price of Anarchy and Price of stability are $\text{POA} \leq \frac{n^2}{|P|}$ and $\text{POS} = 1$ respectively.*

Proof. As a corollary of Theorem 2 we observe that the price of stability is $\text{POS} = 1$. This is because Part 1 of Theorem 2 shows that a Nash equilibrium which corresponds to a stable matching can always be found, even though all Nash equilibria may not correspond to stable matchings. Thus, the best-case guarantee, i.e., $\text{POS} = 1$.

For the price of anarchy, Theorem 2(ii) provides the following upper bound: $\text{POA} \leq \frac{n^2}{|P|}$. Through the following example, we show that in some cases $\text{POA} = \frac{n^2}{|P|}$.

Consider a stable matching instance consisting of five men and five women, with preferences as listed below. The DA matching is underlined in the instance.

m_1 :	w_2^*	<u>w_1</u>	w_3	w_4	w_5	w_1 :	<u>m_1</u>	m_3	m_2^*	m_4	m_5
m_2 :	w_1^*	<u>w_2</u>	w_3	w_4	w_5	w_2 :	<u>m_2</u>	m_3	m_1^*	m_4	m_5
m_3 :	w_1	<u>w_2</u>	<u>w_3^*</u>	w_4	w_5	w_3 :	<u>m_3^*</u>	m_1	m_2	m_4	m_5
m_4 :	<u>w_4</u>	w_5^*	<u>w_1</u>	w_2	w_3	w_4 :	m_5^*	m_3	m_1	m_2	<u>m_4</u>
m_5 :	<u>w_5</u>	w_4^*	w_1	w_2	w_3	w_5 :	m_4^*	m_1	m_2	m_3	<u>m_5</u>

Let the set of strategic pairs be given by $P = M \times W \setminus \{(m_3, w_1), (m_3, w_2)\}$, i.e., all possible pairs apart from (m_3, w_1) and (m_3, w_2) are strategic pairs. Consider the strategic profile \succ' where m_3 reports $w_4 \succ' w_3 \succ' w_1 \succ' w_2 \succ' w_5$ and everyone else reports truthfully. One can verify that this is a Nash equilibrium profile and its corresponding matching $\mu_{\succ'} = \text{DA}(\succ')$ is the one marked by $*$. However, both (m_3, w_1) and (m_3, w_2) are blocking pairs. Thus, the number of stable pairs in the matching $*$ is $\text{NSP}(\mu_{\succ'}) = n^2 - 2 = |P|$; thereby, $\text{POA} = \frac{n^2}{|P|}$. \square

Example of an instance for which different realizations of the push-up dynamics leads to different NE matchings. Here's an instance with $n = 30$ and the set of strategic pairs as $P = M \times W$. Both, men and women, are named as integers in $[1, 30]$. The preference lists of individual agents are represented as a list of agents' from the other side, ordered from most to least preferred. Below, are the true preferences of the agents.

Men's preference profile: [[22, 18, 15, 28, 25, 3, 19, 1, 23, 20, 16, 8, 27, 2, 24, 30, 21, 9, 10, 13, 11, 14, 26, 17, 29, 12, 6, 7, 5, 4], [25, 1, 4, 23, 3, 15, 22, 12, 26, 8, 7, 17, 9, 11, 16, 28, 19, 10, 2, 14, 5, 18, 21, 29, 30, 27, 24, 6, 20, 13], [18, 16, 12, 13, 22, 27, 15, 30, 4, 2, 11, 23, 1, 28, 3, 24, 5, 26, 19, 29, 17, 8, 20, 10, 21, 6, 25, 9, 7, 14], [11, 30, 19, 23, 16, 14, 17, 21, 26, 10, 28, 27, 15, 13, 8, 5, 29, 4, 22, 6, 20, 7, 1, 25, 3, 18, 12, 24, 9, 2], [30, 16, 19, 7, 2, 27, 24, 13, 8, 6, 17, 20, 12, 9, 5, 23, 3, 1, 22, 25, 26, 4, 15, 11, 10, 18, 21, 29, 14, 28], [18, 17, 24, 7, 25, 29, 27, 28, 14, 10, 5, 19, 9, 4, 6, 20, 23, 3, 13, 16, 2, 12, 1, 26, 30, 15, 11, 22, 8, 21], [28, 6, 7, 18, 3, 10, 17, 21, 19, 22, 5, 12, 30, 9, 14, 13, 20, 1, 23, 24, 27, 11, 29, 26, 25, 4, 15, 2, 8, 16], [15, 7, 14, 5, 28, 27, 20, 2, 22, 1, 6, 18, 24, 29, 21, 3, 9, 17, 23, 19, 4, 10, 30, 25, 26, 13, 8, 12, 11, 16], [14, 4, 19, 17, 29, 24, 30, 8, 12, 27, 2, 6, 9, 1, 20, 15, 3, 16, 18, 11, 13, 22, 21, 25, 23, 5, 26, 7, 28, 10], [7, 28, 2, 19, 22, 4, 29, 24, 15, 17, 25, 23, 5, 6, 1, 21, 13, 11, 10, 8, 30, 9, 16, 20, 12, 3, 18, 14, 26, 27], [8, 22, 28, 10, 1, 9, 16, 4, 14, 6, 17, 19, 24, 25, 5, 18, 13, 11, 21, 3, 30, 27, 26, 2, 23, 29, 15, 20, 7, 12], [7, 29, 26, 9, 5, 2, 1, 15, 12, 8, 3, 25, 16, 24, 17, 28, 14, 19, 23, 10, 4, 13, 11, 6, 18, 30, 27, 22, 21, 20], [21, 13, 15, 8, 2, 24, 6, 12, 30, 4, 23, 7, 17, 10, 27, 20, 26, 14, 29, 19, 9, 11, 25, 18, 1, 22, 16, 5, 3, 28], [20, 17, 23, 30, 27, 10, 3, 16, 24, 5, 25, 13, 12, 4, 1, 28, 29, 21, 22, 2, 7, 14, 8, 6, 11, 18, 19, 15, 9, 26], [15, 25, 9, 12, 26, 20, 8, 23, 28, 11, 14, 18, 22, 5, 17, 30, 27, 3, 29, 7, 1, 13, 10, 21, 2, 24, 16, 6, 19, 4], [16, 19, 12, 24, 5, 1, 3, 10, 22, 2, 26, 23, 14, 25, 11, 9, 15, 28, 4, 30, 7, 6, 29, 27, 8, 13, 17, 21, 18, 20], [15, 9, 1, 29, 24, 12, 8, 7, 25, 4, 23, 6, 5, 22, 13, 17, 26, 21, 30, 11, 16, 28, 18, 19, 10, 2, 3, 14, 27, 20], [21, 17, 9, 20, 1, 15, 6, 23, 11, 22, 29, 3, 12, 8, 24, 5, 7, 4, 2, 26, 16, 19, 18, 27, 28, 14, 13, 30, 25, 10], [24, 30, 16, 29, 15, 22, 23, 7, 28, 26, 14, 19, 1, 9, 11, 18, 27, 10, 17, 25, 6, 12, 2, 8, 3, 4, 20, 5, 13, 21], [25, 29, 1, 23, 12, 27, 7, 2, 19, 30, 18, 22, 5, 13, 3, 26, 16, 4, 28, 20, 9, 17, 15, 21, 10, 11, 8, 6, 14, 24], [21, 2, 25, 24, 26, 14, 22, 28, 20, 18, 9, 12, 8, 5, 17, 16, 23, 11, 30, 4, 15, 13, 19, 10, 7, 3, 29, 6, 1, 27], [17, 7, 10, 29, 4, 26, 9, 5, 14, 22, 1, 18, 3, 25, 20, 28, 2, 30, 11, 13, 6, 19, 23, 12, 8, 15, 24, 21, 16, 27], [27, 28, 29, 25, 20, 8, 7, 24, 30, 12, 17, 11, 13, 5, 22, 2, 3, 23, 26, 19, 4, 18, 10, 16, 1, 15, 21, 9, 14, 6], [21, 29, 6, 25, 4, 12, 23, 20, 7, 22, 11, 19, 5, 2, 24, 9, 18, 26, 16, 3, 28, 8, 27, 17, 10, 30, 1, 14, 15, 13], [2, 30, 22, 3, 13, 1, 11, 19, 21, 17, 29, 8, 23, 26, 14, 10, 28, 6, 4, 15, 7, 16, 25, 12, 9, 24, 18, 5, 20, 27], [20, 21, 7, 15, 2, 19, 25, 16, 29, 17, 13, 23, 10, 22, 30, 12, 18, 14, 27, 26, 3, 4, 6, 28, 11, 5, 8, 24, 9, 1], [6, 7, 22, 13, 5, 18, 16, 17, 4, 3, 11, 12, 9, 27, 24, 30, 25, 1, 15, 10, 26, 28, 23, 20, 29, 14, 19, 2, 8, 21], [6, 13, 28, 8, 26, 10, 9, 25, 23, 15, 2, 29, 16, 3, 17, 5, 24, 7, 1, 11, 14, 20, 27, 19, 21, 18, 22, 4, 12, 30], [29, 17, 11, 30, 10, 13, 24, 21, 19, 25, 23, 1, 12, 27, 6, 3, 9, 4, 8, 14, 26, 18, 22, 2, 20, 28, 5, 15, 7, 16], [2, 18, 16, 28, 5, 24, 9, 15, 30, 13, 29, 17, 22, 11, 7, 10, 8, 19, 23, 27, 21, 20, 14, 3, 25, 1, 26, 6, 4, 12]]

Women's preference profile: [[21, 5, 14, 23, 4, 1, 27, 24, 13, 17, 11, 22, 2, 10, 19, 8, 3, 15, 16, 18, 6, 26, 20, 12, 29, 7, 9, 28, 25, 30], [14, 11, 23, 26, 4, 21, 10, 28, 16, 3, 25, 5, 17, 20, 1, 27, 24, 9, 29, 12, 6, 30, 7, 13, 22, 15, 19, 8, 18, 2], [4, 29, 27, 23, 28, 17, 8, 26, 5, 25, 6, 16, 14, 15, 1, 24, 10, 7, 13, 11, 3, 18, 22, 30, 9, 12, 2, 21, 19, 20], [10, 13, 12, 19, 4, 11, 24, 28, 6, 23, 3, 25, 14, 17, 20, 5, 27, 15, 26, 8, 16, 18, 2, 1, 21, 7, 29, 30, 9, 22], [17, 29, 20, 9, 10, 13, 26, 23, 22, 28, 4, 5, 21, 30, 3, 19, 27, 12, 24, 2, 7, 18, 16, 25, 1, 8, 14, 6, 11, 15], [10, 22, 5, 1, 7, 20, 2, 30, 4, 14, 8, 26, 16, 12, 3, 6, 9, 18, 21, 13, 29, 28, 23, 19, 11, 24, 27, 15, 25, 17], [26, 13, 16, 8, 24, 25, 20, 4, 7, 5, 2, 14, 9, 29, 27, 18, 15, 19, 11, 1, 22, 30, 17, 12, 23, 3, 10, 6, 21, 28], [1, 28, 15, 11, 10, 25, 8, 30, 21, 26, 16, 19, 27, 17, 23, 12, 24, 5, 20, 2, 18, 7, 6, 14, 13, 3, 22, 9, 4, 29], [2, 27, 4, 11, 20, 6, 22, 7, 16, 5, 17, 24, 14, 26, 15, 10, 30, 13, 19, 23, 3, 21, 1, 25, 18, 28, 8, 9, 29, 12], [30, 4, 7, 28, 3, 10, 13, 27, 20, 16, 14, 26, 5, 2, 11, 9, 24, 23, 6, 17, 19, 1, 15, 22, 25, 8, 29, 12, 18, 21], [29, 7, 28, 23, 26, 10, 20, 21, 24, 6, 1, 18, 15, 19, 5, 11, 13, 16, 4, 17, 3, 8, 12, 14, 25, 9, 27, 22, 30, 2], [4, 28, 9, 27, 8, 30, 1, 25, 24, 6, 2, 16, 19, 29, 15, 13, 5, 12, 21, 3, 17, 7, 26, 11, 10, 18, 20, 23, 22, 14], [18, 28, 5, 7, 23, 2, 24, 22, 16, 13, 10, 9, 21, 1, 14, 29, 3, 19, 6, 25, 4, 27, 17, 20, 30, 12, 8, 26, 15, 11], [11, 14, 7, 16, 26, 19, 5, 21, 10, 12, 15, 4, 1, 22, 28, 30, 13, 17, 8, 6, 27, 2, 24, 20, 25, 3, 18, 9, 29, 23], [23, 9, 8, 21, 22, 29, 24, 15, 14, 27, 4, 13, 10, 25, 11, 7, 28, 26, 1, 5, 16, 12, 2, 20, 6, 3, 18, 30, 17, 19], [16, 29, 6, 5, 26, 2, 7, 3, 24, 22, 19, 8, 13, 18, 12, 15, 17, 9, 10, 25, 20, 11, 30, 28, 27, 4, 21, 1, 23, 14], [21, 23, 2, 13, 28, 22, 27, 10, 7, 29, 8, 9, 25, 11, 24, 6, 15, 30, 17, 19, 26, 20, 18, 16, 3, 12, 4, 14, 1, 5], [18, 24, 30, 10, 1, 14, 26, 16, 4, 7, 29, 25, 8, 5, 19, 13, 9, 3, 23, 2, 21, 27, 17, 20, 12, 15, 6, 11, 28, 22], [4, 19, 12, 29, 28, 30, 9, 3, 24, 7, 13, 18, 20, 15, 5, 23, 17, 16, 25, 6, 11, 21, 26, 2, 22, 1, 10, 8, 14, 27], [14, 11, 10, 28, 25, 18, 26, 15, 13, 21, 1, 30, 17, 6, 2, 23, 12, 5, 16, 20, 4, 19, 22, 8, 7, 29, 24, 9, 3, 27], [25, 18, 19, 9, 30, 28, 27, 17, 26, 7, 11, 13, 24, 29, 22, 21, 6, 12, 1, 5, 2, 23, 15, 4, 20, 10, 16, 3, 14, 8], [7, 13, 24, 19, 9, 3, 15, 17, 10, 2, 12, 8, 14, 22, 18, 27, 23, 21, 29, 25, 28, 4, 26, 16, 6, 11, 1, 30, 5, 20], [7, 1, 27, 14, 29, 4, 13, 10, 11, 12, 9, 8, 21, 24, 23, 5, 19, 17, 22, 26, 28, 16, 25, 3, 15, 18, 20, 30, 2, 6], [4, 25, 21, 10, 29, 16, 30, 14, 19, 20, 24, 27, 9, 6, 12, 5, 1, 8, 7, 3, 13, 18, 26, 28, 23, 2, 11, 17, 22, 15], [7, 1, 18, 10, 2, 14, 21, 17, 3, 29, 27, 4, 6, 12, 20, 8, 22, 15, 16, 25, 11, 23, 9, 30, 26, 19, 5, 13, 24, 28], [26, 7, 18, 1, 21, 14, 10, 12, 17, 25, 29, 3, 22, 8, 16, 13, 15, 20, 4, 23, 27, 2, 19, 28, 11, 30, 24, 6, 5, 9], [6, 5, 30, 18, 14, 27, 7, 29, 13, 4, 26, 23, 3, 21, 8, 11, 25, 16, 22, 20, 10, 28, 2, 9, 15, 12, 1, 17, 24, 19], [4, 3, 7, 6, 15, 24, 27, 19, 20, 9, 1, 30, 23, 2, 5, 13, 21, 18, 28, 29, 25, 22, 17, 10, 26, 14, 16, 12, 8, 11], [16, 18, 28, 26, 12, 10, 21, 20, 3, 22, 5, 6, 13, 9, 25, 24, 23, 4, 19, 8, 14, 2, 11, 17, 7, 30, 27, 1, 29, 15], [15, 10, 14, 4, 11,

5, 3, 13, 24, 9, 2, 27, 6, 8, 12, 28, 18, 1, 7, 26, 25, 17, 29, 21, 30, 20, 22, 16, 19, 23]].

Next, we show two different realizations of the push-up dynamics, each resulting from different pairs of manipulators at each time step. The resulting NE profiles correspond to different matchings under DA. At each time step in the dynamics, we indicate the manipulating pair and the manipulated list of the accomplice man.

Dynamics 1:

Accomplice man is 22 and the manipulator women is 1 and the changed preference list is [25, 9, 22, 30, 19, 27, 28, 15, 14, 4, 8, 29, 13, 20, 26, 16, 1, 21, 24, 23, 2, 10, 17, 12, 3, 7, 5, 6, 11, 18]

Accomplice man is 1 and the manipulator women is 6 and the changed preference list is [25, 9, 22, 30, 6, 27, 28, 15, 14, 4, 8, 29, 23, 20, 26, 16, 1, 21, 24, 19, 2, 10, 17, 12, 3, 7, 5, 13, 11, 18]

Accomplice man is 9 and the manipulator women is 8 and the changed preference list is [25, 9, 22, 30, 6, 27, 28, 15, 14, 4, 10, 29, 23, 20, 8, 16, 1, 21, 24, 19, 2, 26, 17, 12, 3, 7, 5, 13, 11, 18]

Accomplice man is 8 and the manipulator women is 21 and the changed preference list is [25, 9, 22, 30, 6, 27, 28, 15, 14, 4, 10, 26, 23, 20, 8, 16, 1, 29, 24, 19, 2, 5, 17, 12, 21, 7, 3, 13, 11, 18]

Interestingly, woman 21 did not have an incentive to manipulate in the truthful profile and the possibility of obtaining a better partner only arose after the manipulations by the first three pairs.

Dynamics 2: Here, woman 1 does not use man 22 as her accomplice, instead uses man 27.

Accomplice man is 27 and the manipulator women is 1 and the changed preference list is [25, 9, 22, 30, 19, 27, 28, 15, 14, 4, 8, 29, 13, 20, 26, 16, 1, 21, 24, 23, 2, 10, 17, 12, 3, 7, 5, 6, 11, 18]

Accomplice man is 1 and the manipulator women is 6 and the changed preference list is [25, 9, 22, 30, 6, 27, 28, 15, 14, 4, 8, 29, 23, 20, 26, 16, 1, 21, 24, 19, 2, 10, 17, 12, 3, 7, 5, 13, 11, 18]

Accomplice man is 1 and the manipulator women is 8 and the changed preference list is [25, 9, 22, 30, 6, 27, 28, 15, 14, 4, 10, 29, 23, 20, 8, 16, 1, 21, 24, 19, 2, 26, 17, 12, 3, 7, 5, 13, 11, 18]

In the DA matching for these two NE, women 3, 5, 7, 21, 26, 29 are matched to different partners. In Dynamic 1, the first accomplice man 22 eventually incurred regret as compared to his truthful partner even though he did not incur regret when he manipulated. Thus, in Dynamic 2 where man 22 does not manipulate first, after the manipulations by other men, he is not able to no-regret manipulate. But the manipulation by man 22 was crucial for woman 21 to receive a better partner in Dynamic 1.

C Omitted Material from Section 5

C.1 One-for-Many Manipulation Games

Theorem 3. For a one-for-many game with $(P_m, \{P_w^m\}_m)$ as the set of strategic players, consider an accomplice manipulation game in which the strategic players are defined as follows: $P' = \{(m, w) \mid m \in P_m \text{ and } w \in P_w^m\}$. Then, every NE profile \succ_{NE} of the accomplice game is also an NE profile of the one-for-many manipulation game.

Proof. Towards a contradiction, let \succ_{NE} be a strategy profile that is a Nash equilibrium in the accomplice manipulation game but not a Nash equilibrium in the one-for-all game. This means that there exists a man $m \in P_m$ who can manipulate and obtain a Pareto dominant outcome for everyone in P_w ; let w be a woman who strictly benefits from m 's misreport. This means that $(m, w) \in P$ is an accomplice pair at \succ_{NE} , contradicting the fact that \succ_{NE} is a Nash equilibrium for the accomplice game. \square

C.2 Woman Self-Manipulation Games

Here, we provide the proof of Theorem 4 and of the required lemmata. Given an instance $\langle M, W, \succ \rangle$, the players are the set of manipulating women $P_w \subseteq W$ and a strategy profile \mathbf{p}' is a list of strict total orderings over agents in M submitted by all women in P_w . Given a strategy profile \mathbf{p} , a *self manipulation* by w is a misreport \mathbf{p}'_w such that, for $\mu_{\mathbf{p}} := DA(\succ_{-P_w}, \mathbf{p})$ and $\mu_{\mathbf{p}'} := DA(\succ_{-P_w}, \mathbf{p}_{-w}, \mathbf{p}'_w)$, we have $\mu_{\mathbf{p}'} \succ_w \mu_{\mathbf{p}}$. Then,

a strategy profile \succ_{NE} is said to be a Nash equilibrium (NE) if there does not exist a woman $w \in P_w$ such that w can perform a self manipulation at the profile \succ_{NE} .

Given any two strategy profiles \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{p}' , for every woman w we can represent the preference list of w in the strategy profile \mathbf{p}' based on the DA matching corresponding to the profile \mathbf{p} (i.e., $\mu_{\mathbf{p}}$) as $\mathbf{p}'_w = (\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}'_w, \mu_{\mathbf{p}}), \mu_{\mathbf{p}}(w), \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p}'_w, \mu_{\mathbf{p}}))$, where $\mu_{\mathbf{p}}(w)$ is w 's partner under the matching $\mu_{\mathbf{p}}$. Here, $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}'_w, \mu_{\mathbf{p}})$ is the set of men that w reports as better than $\mu_{\mathbf{p}}(w)$ in \mathbf{p}'_w and $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p}'_w, \mu_{\mathbf{p}})$ is the set of men who are ranked lower than $\mu_{\mathbf{p}}(w)$ in \mathbf{p}'_w . The notion of a push-up operation $\mathbf{p}^{X\uparrow}$ by lifting a set X of men in the preference list of w above her match in \mathbf{p} is also lifted from the case of men manipulation, and we say that it is inconspicuous if $|X| = 1$. Let us recall several facts regarding optimal manipulations by a self-manipulating woman.

Proposition 7. [Theorems 4 and 5, Vaish and Garg [2017]] *Given an instance $\langle M, W, \succ \rangle$, any optimal manipulation \succ' by a woman can be performed in an inconspicuous manner. Furthermore, $\mathcal{S}_{\succ'} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{\succ}$.*

As in the case of accomplice manipulations, we construct a best-response dynamics which, when it converges, finds a Nash equilibrium of the woman self-manipulation game.

Inconspicuous dynamics. For a stable matching instance $\langle M, W, \succ \rangle$ and a set of strategic women P_w , an inconspicuous dynamic starting at $\mathbf{p}^{(1)} = \succ$ is a sequence of strategy profiles $\bar{\mathbf{p}} = (\mathbf{p}^{(1)}, \dots)$, where each subsequent profile $\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)}$ results from an optimal inconspicuous self-manipulation by some strategic woman $w \in P_w$ in the matching instance $\langle M, W, \mathbf{p}^{(t)} \rangle$, if possible. Otherwise, $\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)} = \mathbf{p}^{(t)}$.

In the next lemma, we show some properties of the inconspicuous dynamics; these help us establish that this sequence always converges and the converged point is an NE.

Lemma 4. *Take a set of strategic women P_w in the woman self-manipulation game, and an inconspicuous dynamic $\bar{\mathbf{p}} = (\mathbf{p}^{(1)}, \mathbf{p}^{(2)}, \dots)$. Then, when $\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)} \neq \mathbf{p}^{(t)}$, the following set inclusion and set equalities hold for each woman w (1) $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)}} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}} \subseteq \dots \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{p}^{(1)}} = \mathcal{S}_{\succ}$, and (2) $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p}_w^{(t+1)}, \mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)}}) = \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p}_w^{(t)}, \mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)}}) = \dots = \mathcal{R}(\succ_w, \mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)}})$.*

With these properties, we show that the inconspicuous dynamics converge.

Theorem 4. (NE of woman self-manipulation game) *For a woman manipulation game with strategic women $P_w \subseteq W$, the inconspicuous dynamics converges in polynomial time. Moreover, the converged point is an NE.*

Proof. Notice first that if $\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)} \neq \mathbf{p}^{(t)}$, then there is some woman $w \in P_w$ who can manipulate (optimally, inconspicuously) in the instance $\langle M, W, \mathbf{p}^{(t)} \rangle$. By Lemma 4, we have that $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)}} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}}$. By Proposition 1(iii),

$$\mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}} \succ_M^{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}} \mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)}}.$$

Since in the inconspicuous dynamics of self manipulations by women, men do not change their preference profiles, we have that $\succ_M^{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}} = \succ_M$ for every t in the dynamic. Thus, $\mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}} \succ_M \mu_{\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)}}$, and, by potential argument, the set of men can be worse-off with respect to \succ only finitely many times. Thus, at some point $\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)} = \mathbf{p}^{(t)}$.

Notice that at every t in which $\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)} \neq \mathbf{p}^{(t)}$, at least one man get strictly worse-off. He can get worse-off only n many times, and there are only n such men. Thus, the sequence must converge by $i \leq n^2$.

When $\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)} = \mathbf{p}^{(t)}$, then $\mathbf{p}^{(t)}$ is a fixed point and there is no strategic woman $w \in P_w$ who can perform an inconspicuous self manipulation in the instance $\langle M, W, \mathbf{p}^{(t)} \rangle$. Thus, if the converged point $\mathbf{p}^{(t)}$ is not an NE, then some woman $w \in P_w$ can perform a self manipulation at $\mathbf{p}^{(t)}$; let this manipulation be \succ'_w .

Consider the matching corresponding to \succ' which is $\mu' = \text{DA}(\succ'_w, \mathbf{p}^{(t+1)}_{-w})$. Since it is a beneficial manipulation, w 's partner is such that $\mu'(w) \notin \mathcal{R}(\succ, \mathbf{p}^{(t)}, w)$. But from Lemma 17 (ii), we know that $\mathcal{R}(\succ, \mathbf{p}^{(t)}, w) = \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p}^{(t)}, \mathbf{p}^{(t)}, w)$. Thus, $\mu'(w) \notin \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p}^{(t)}, \mathbf{p}^{(t)}, w)$. However, this contradicts that w can not perform a manipulation in the instance $\langle M, W, \mathbf{p}^{(t)} \rangle$. \square

D Omitted Experimental Results

In this section, we present the missing plots from Section 6.

Length of dynamics. As mentioned, we study the impact of instance size and correlated preferences on the length of the dynamics.

Figure 5 presents results on the impact of instance size on the length of the dynamics for both, accomplice and self manipulation games.




Figure 5: Length of the constructed dynamics as a function of the instance size n . The plot on the left gives the maximum length across the samples for every considered instance size. The plot on the right considers the average length across the samples as a function of n .

Next, we present the plots for the effect of correlated preferences, measured through the dispersion parameters in Mallows' model, on the length of the push-up dynamics in the accomplice manipulation game (see Figure 6).




Figure 6: Length of push-up dynamics in accomplice manipulation games as a function of the dispersion parameters (ϕ_w, ϕ_m) . The left plot is for the average length, whereas the one on the right is for the maximum length across the samples.

The equivalent plots for the woman self-manipulation game and its corresponding inconspicuous dynamics are presented next (see Figure 7).

Welfare of agents. First, we plot the welfare of the best-off woman and the worst-off man in the accomplice and woman self-manipulation games in Figure 8 and Figure 9 respectively.

Finally, the plots for the average gain by women in NE of the accomplice and self-manipulation game, as a function of correlated preferences, are presented in Figure 10.




Figure 7: Length of inconspicuous dynamic in woman self-manipulation games as a function of dispersion parameters (ϕ_w, ϕ_m) .




Figure 8: Accomplice manipulation game: Women’s gain and men’s loss in NE profile as a function of the instance size. The left graph plots the gain for the average change, whereas the one on the right considers the change for the best-off and worst-off agent.




Figure 9: Woman self-manipulation game: Women’s gain and men’s loss in NE profile as a function of the instance size. The left graph plots the gain for the average change, whereas the one on the right considers the change for the best-off and worst-off agent.




Figure 10: Average gain by women in NE as a function of the dispersion parameters (ϕ_w, ϕ_m) . The plot on the left is for the accomplice manipulation game whereas the plot on the right is for the self-manipulation game.