

Approximation Algorithms for the b -Matching and List-Restricted Variants of MaxQAP

Jiratchaphat Nanta¹, Vorapong Suppakitpaisarn², and Piyashat Sripratak¹

¹ Chiang Mai University, Thailand

² The University of Tokyo, Japan

Abstract. We study approximation algorithms for two natural generalizations of the Maximum Quadratic Assignment Problem (MaxQAP). In the *Maximum List-Restricted Quadratic Assignment Problem*, each node in one partite set may only be matched to nodes from a prescribed list. For instances on n nodes where every list has size at least $n - O(\sqrt{n})$, we design a randomized $O(\sqrt{n})$ -approximation algorithm based on the linear-programming relaxation and randomized rounding framework of Makarychev, Manokaran, and Sviridenko. In the *Maximum Quadratic b -Matching Assignment Problem*, we seek a b -matching that maximizes the MaxQAP objective. We refine the standard MaxQAP relaxation and combine randomized rounding over b independent iterations with a polynomial-time algorithm for maximum-weight b -matching problem to obtain an $O(\sqrt{bn})$ -approximation. When b is constant and all lists have size $n - O(\sqrt{n})$, our guarantees asymptotically match the best known approximation factor for MaxQAP, yielding the first approximation algorithms for these two variants.

Keywords: Maximum Quadratic Assignment · b -Matching · Approximation Algorithm.

1 Introduction

Given two complete weighted graphs $G = (V_G, E_G, w_G : E_G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$ and $H = (V_H, E_H, w_H : E_H \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$ such that $|V_G| = |V_H| = n$, the *Quadratic Assignment Problem* (QAP) is to find a bijection $\pi : V_G \rightarrow V_H$ that optimizes the quadratic objective $\sum_{u,v \in V_G} w_G(u,v) w_H(\pi(u), \pi(v))$.

In the classical minimization form, the goal is to minimize this sum. The QAP is a fundamental combinatorial optimization problem that models the assignment of a set of facilities to a set of locations with the aim of minimizing the total cost, which depends on the flow between facilities and the distance between locations [10]. It is known to be NP-hard and is considered one of the most challenging problems in the field of optimization [19]. Numerous heuristic and approximation algorithms have been proposed to address its computational complexity in practical applications such as facility layout, scheduling, and electronics design [4]. The QAP has also recently been considered as a target for the Quantum Approximate Optimization Algorithm (QAOA), a quantum heuristic

designed for tackling hard combinatorial optimization problems [5, 21]. Its relevance to quantum algorithm design has drawn increasing attention from the quantum computing community.

MaxQAP and applications. While the standard QAP is typically formulated as a minimization problem, in this paper we focus on its maximization variant, known as *MaxQAP*. MaxQAP is also referred to as the graph matching problem in the fields of pattern recognition and computer vision, where it has numerous applications [2, 12, 22]. Moreover, MaxQAP generalizes the graph isomorphism problem [7]. Owing to its broad range of applications, several approximation algorithms have been proposed for MaxQAP [15, 17]. The best known approximation ratio for the problem to date is $O(\sqrt{n})$.

Motivation for constrained variants. In many applications, the assumption that we are free to choose an arbitrary bijection $\pi : V_G \rightarrow V_H$ is overly idealized. In pattern recognition, a landmark in one image may only correspond to landmarks in a specific region of another image. In network alignment, vertex attributes or metadata may restrict which node in one social network can plausibly correspond to a node in another. In quantum circuit placement, hardware calibration or architectural restrictions may forbid certain logical-to-physical qubit mappings.

Also, in noisy graphs or heterogeneous systems, enforcing a strict one-to-one correspondence can be too rigid. Nodes may represent facilities or resources with limited capacities, supernodes that aggregate several entities, or duplicated objects. Allowing a node to be matched multiple times can yield similarity measures that are more robust to outliers and local noise.

These considerations motivate two natural generalizations of MaxQAP that we study in this paper: a *list-restricted* variant and a *b-matching* variant.

List-restricted MaxQAP. The list-restricted graph isomorphism problem has been studied in settings where each node in graph G can be matched only to a node in a specified subset of V_H , and vice versa [14]. This constraint reflects practical scenarios in which prior knowledge rules out certain node correspondences, and has been investigated from a theoretical perspective in the context of graph isomorphism [8]. In the *list-restricted MaxQAP*, we are given a list $\mathcal{L}(u)$ of admissible images for each u , and we seek a matching π such that u is matched with a node in the list. Despite the similarity to list-restricted graph isomorphism, to the best of our knowledge, no theoretical results currently exist for MaxQAP under list restriction constraints, even in restricted regimes.

MaxQAP with b -matching. A generalization of the classical maximum matching problem is the maximum b -matching problem, where each node is allowed to be matched with up to b other nodes instead of just one. This extension captures a broader range of applications [20] while maintaining tractability, as the problem remains solvable in polynomial time [6, 9]. In our setting, we replace the bijection π by a b -matching between V_G and V_H , and evaluate the same quadratic objective. While solutions to MaxQAP reflect the overall similarity between the input graphs G and H , the b -matching variant offers greater robustness by pro-

viding more accurate similarity measures in the presence of corrupted nodes or inaccurate edge weights.

The b -matching variant of the Maximum Edge-Pair Embedding Bipartite Matching problem [18], which shares a strong connection with MaxQAP, has been explored in [3]. In contrast, to the best of our knowledge, no existing work has extended the MaxQAP formulation itself to incorporate a b -matching constraint.

Relation to GQAP. The Generalized Quadratic Assignment Problem (GQAP) has been the subject of various studies [11, 16]. These works typically focus on selecting a subgraph of the input bipartite graph in which nodes on one side have a degree constraint of exactly one, while nodes on the other side may be assigned to multiple partners. This formulation differs from the b -matching setting, where the degrees of *all* nodes are bounded by b . To the best of our knowledge, approximation algorithms for GQAP have not yet been studied in the literature, and existing work is largely heuristic.

1.1 Our Contributions

In this work we initiate the approximation-theoretic study of list-restricted and b -matching variants of MaxQAP. Our main contributions are threefold:

1. We formalize the list-restricted and b -matching variants of the MaxQAP in Section 2, providing a unified framework that captures both types of constraints.
2. Building on the randomized rounding technique introduced in [15], in Section 3 we develop an $O(\sqrt{n})$ -approximation algorithm for the list-restricted variant of MaxQAP, under the condition that each node $u \in V_G$ can be matched to a node in a subset $\mathcal{L}(u)$ of size $|\mathcal{L}(u)| = n - O(\sqrt{n})$.
3. In Section 4, we extend the randomized rounding technique to the b -matching setting and obtain an $O(\sqrt{bn})$ -approximation algorithm for the b -matching variant of MaxQAP. In particular, when b is a constant, our approximation guarantee matches the best known $O(\sqrt{n})$ approximation ratio for standard MaxQAP up to constant factors.

1.2 Technical Overview

The $O(\sqrt{n})$ -approximation for the MaxQAP in [15] is obtained via randomized rounding of a linear-programming (LP) relaxation. They prove that the rounding achieves, in expectation, an $\Omega(1/\sqrt{n})$ fraction of the LP optimum. For the analysis, the LP objective is partitioned into a *heavy* and a *light* part: for each node $p \in V_H$, let \mathcal{W}_p be the set of the k nodes $q \in V_H$ whose weights $w_H(p, q)$ are the largest; the heavy part consists of contributions with $q \in \mathcal{W}_p$, and the light part is the remainder. The rounding guarantees that the result objective is $\Omega(|\mathcal{W}_p|/n) = \Omega(1/\sqrt{n})$ fraction of the light part in the optimal solution, yielding the stated $O(\sqrt{n})$ approximation ratio.

To obtain an algorithm for the list-restricted MaxQAP, we modify the LP relaxation to satisfy the list-restricted constraint. This modification can substantially reduce our objective value, because some nodes in \mathcal{W}_p cannot contribute to the randomized rounding objective under the new constraints. As a result, the stated fraction of the light part is no longer guaranteed to be achieved. To solve this issue, suppose each node in G can be matched to at least $n - k$ nodes for a constant k . We expand \mathcal{W}_p to have size $\lceil k + \sqrt{n} \rceil$. Even if up to k of the top choices are excluded by the lists, at least \sqrt{n} candidates remain. Hence, the rounding still captures an $\Omega(1/\sqrt{n})$ fraction of the LP optimum, yielding an $O(\sqrt{n})$ -approximation for the list-restricted problem.

Our approach for the b -matching variant of MaxQAP leverages the fact that a b -matching can be decomposed into b disjoint matchings. We therefore perform b iterative rounds of the randomized rounding process, then combine the results obtained from those b rounds. While a straightforward analysis of this approach yields an $O(b\sqrt{n})$ -approximation, our refined analysis improves the guarantee to an $O(\sqrt{bn})$ -approximation.

2 Problem Formulation

List-Restricted MaxQAP. An instance of the maximum list-restricted quadratic assignment problem (List-Restricted MaxQAP) consists of two weighted graphs, $G = (V_G, E_G, w_G)$ and $H = (V_H, E_H, w_H)$ such that $|V_G| = |V_H| = n$, a non-negative integer k , and a restricted list $\mathcal{L}(u) \subseteq V_H$, where $|\mathcal{L}(u)| \geq n - k$, for each node $u \in V_G$. The set of feasible solutions consists of *compatible matchings* which are matchings on a bipartite graph (V_G, V_H, E_{GH}) where $E_{GH} = \{(u, p) \in V_G \times V_H : p \in \mathcal{L}(u)\}$. The objective is to find a compatible matching M that maximizes $\sum_{(u,p),(v,q) \in M} w_G(u, v) w_H(p, q)$.

MaxQbAP. Suppose that we have two weighted graphs, $G = (V_G, E_G, w_G)$ and $H = (V_H, E_H, w_H)$ such that $|V_G| = |V_H| = n$, and a positive integer $b \leq n$. The Maximum Quadratic b -matching Assignment Problem (MaxQbAP) is to find a b -matching bM between V_G and V_H that maximizes

$$\sum_{u,v \in V_G} \sum_{p,q \in V_H} w_G(u, v) w_H(p, q) \mathbf{1}(\{(u, p), (v, q)\} \subseteq {}^bM \vee \{(u, q), (v, p)\} \subseteq {}^bM)$$

The objective uses an indicator to check whether an edge $\{u, v\} \in E_G$ is mapped to $\{p, q\} \in E_H$ by bM . Because this form is cumbersome to analyze, we instead study a variant, **dup-MaxQbAP**, which seeks a b -matching bM that maximizes $\sum_{(u,p),(v,q) \in {}^bM} w_G(u, v) w_H(p, q)$. If $(u, p), (u, q), (v, p), (v, q) \in {}^bM$, then the term $w_G(u, v) w_H(p, q)$ is counted twice in the objective of dup-MaxQbAP, whereas in our extension it should be counted only once.

In Appendix A, we show that any α -approximation for dup-MaxQbAP induces a 2α -approximation for MaxQbAP. Hence an $O(\sqrt{bn})$ -approximation for dup-MaxQbAP also holds for MaxQbAP, and we therefore focus on the dup-MaxQbAP formulation for the remainder of the paper.

For convenience, we use a symbol \perp , distinct from every $u \in V_G$, to represent an unmatched outcome. Accordingly, in all subsequent algorithms we take $\pi : V_G \rightarrow V_H \cup \{\perp\}$, with $\pi(u) = \perp$ meaning that u is left unmatched in V_H .

3 Approximation Algorithm for List-Restricted MaxQAP

For each $u \in V_G$, recall that a list $\mathcal{L}(u)$ is a list of nodes that u can be matched with and $|\mathcal{L}(u)| \geq n - k$. We present an $O(\sqrt{n})$ -approximation algorithm for the case $k = O(\sqrt{n})$ of this problem. Based on the integer programming for MaxQAP by Adams and Johnson [1], where x_{up} and y_{upvq} are binary variables that indicate the event “ $(u, p) \in M$ ” and “ $(u, p), (v, q) \in M$ ”, we add the additional conditions that prevent each node u to be matched to nodes that are not in $\mathcal{L}(u)$, i.e., $x_{up} = 0$ for all $u \in V_G$ and $p \in V_H \setminus \mathcal{L}(u)$. Our modified relaxed LP is then stated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{(Relaxed LP1)} \quad & \text{Maximize} \quad \sum_{u,v \in V_G} \sum_{p,q \in V_H} w_G(u,v) w_H(p,q) y_{upvq} \\
 \text{subject to} \quad & \sum_{p \in V_H} x_{up} \leq 1 \quad \text{for all } u \in V_G; \\
 & \sum_{u \in V_G} x_{up} \leq 1 \quad \text{for all } p \in V_H; \\
 & \sum_{p \in V_H} y_{upvq} \leq x_{vq} \quad \text{for all } u, v \in V_G \text{ and } q \in V_H; \\
 & \sum_{u \in V_G} y_{upvq} \leq x_{vq} \quad \text{for all } v \in V_G \text{ and } p, q \in V_H; \\
 & y_{upvq} = y_{vqup} \quad \text{for all } u, v \in V_G \text{ and } p, q \in V_H; \\
 & x_{up} \in [0, 1] \quad \text{for all } u \in V_G \text{ and } p \in \mathcal{L}(u); \\
 & x_{up} = 0 \quad \text{for all } u \in V_G \text{ and } p \in V_H \setminus \mathcal{L}(u); \\
 & y_{upvq} \in [0, 1] \quad \text{for all } u, v \in V_G \text{ and } p, q \in V_H.
 \end{aligned}$$

Our algorithm for List-Restricted MaxQAP is as follows:

Algorithm 1:

Input: $G = (V_G, E_G, w_G)$ and $H = (V_H, E_H, w_H)$ such that $|V_G| = |V_H| = n$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, and $\mathcal{L}(u) \subseteq V_H$, where $|\mathcal{L}(u)| \geq n - k$, for each $u \in V_G$

Output: A compatible matching M between V_G and V_H

1. Solve Relaxed LP1 and obtain an optimal solution: $(x_{up}^*)_{u \in V_G, p \in V_H}$ and $(y_{upvq}^*)_{u,v \in V_G, p,q \in V_H}$.
2. Partition V_G randomly into G_L and G_R , such that $|G_L| = \lceil n/2 \rceil$ and $G_R = V_G \setminus G_L$. Do the same for V_H to obtain H_L and H_R .
3. For each $p \in H_L$, let p choose a node from $G_L \cup \{\perp\}$ with probability x_{up}^* for $u \in G_L$ and $1 - \sum_{u \in V_G} x_{up}^*$ for \perp . Then, define a function $\pi : H_L \rightarrow G_L \cup \{\perp\}$ such that $\pi(p)$ is the node that p have chosen.
4. For each $u \in G_L$, let $\pi^{-1}(u)$ be a set of node $p \in H_L$ such that $\pi(p) = u$. For each $u \in G_L$ such that $\pi^{-1}(u) \neq \emptyset$, randomly choose an element p in $\pi^{-1}(u)$ and assign (u, p) to a compatible matching M_L .

5. For each $v \in G_R$ and $q \in H_R$, let $w(v, q) = \sum_{(u,p) \in M_L} w_G(u, v) w_H(p, q)$ if $q \in \mathcal{L}(v)$, and $w(v, q) = 0$ otherwise. Let M_R be a maximum compatible matching between G_R and H_R with respect to w that does not contain zero-weighted edge. The compatible matching M_R can be calculated in polynomial time using the maximum matching algorithm.
6. Return $M = M_L \cup M_R$.

To show that Algorithm 1 is indeed an $O(\sqrt{n})$ -approximation algorithm for the case $k = O(\sqrt{n})$, we assume $k = O(\sqrt{n})$ and let LP^* be the optimal value given by an optimal solution of Relaxed LP1. For each $p \in V_H$, let \mathcal{W}_p be the set of $\lceil \sqrt{n} + k \rceil$ nodes in V_H whose weights of the edges from these nodes to p are the largest. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} LP^* &= \sum_{u,v \in V_G} \sum_{p,q \in V_H} w_G(u, v) w_H(p, q) y_{upvq}^* \\ &= \sum_{u,v \in V_G} \sum_{\substack{p \in V_H \\ q \in \mathcal{W}_p}} w_G(u, v) w_H(p, q) y_{upvq}^* + \sum_{u,v \in V_G} \sum_{\substack{p \in V_H \\ q \in V_H \setminus \mathcal{W}_p}} w_G(u, v) w_H(p, q) y_{upvq}^*. \end{aligned}$$

Denote the first sum as LP_1^* and the second sum as LP_2^* . For any compatible matching M between V_G and V_H , let $Obj(M) = \sum_{(u,p),(v,q) \in M} w_G(u, v) w_H(p, q)$.

However, in this analysis of the algorithm which provides two compatible matchings, M_L and M_R , between each pair of the corresponding partites of V_G and V_H , we mainly focus on $Obj'(M_L, M_R) = \sum_{\substack{(u,p) \in M_L \\ (v,q) \in M_R}} w_G(u, v) w_H(p, q)$ and utilize the fact that $Obj(M_L \cup M_R) \geq Obj'(M_L, M_R)$ in our analysis. For a fixed M_L , by the choice of constructing M_R , we have $Obj'(M_L, M_R) \geq Obj'(M_L, M'_R)$ for any other compatible matching M'_R between G_R and H_R . In the next lemma, we set $M'_R := M'_{\text{rand}}$, a random matching between G_R and H_R . The formal construction of M'_{rand} and the lemma's proof are deferred to Appendix B.

Lemma 1. $\mathbb{E}[Obj'(M_L, M_R)] \geq LP_2^*/O(\sqrt{n})$.

Proof sketch. Randomly split V_G, V_H into G_L, H_L, G_R, H_R as in Algorithm 1. By Lemma B2,

$$\Pr[(u, p) \in M_L \wedge (v, q) \in M'_{\text{rand}} \mid u \in G_L, p \in H_L, v \in G_R, q \in H_R] \geq \frac{x_{up}^*}{2|G_R|} \geq \frac{x_{up}^*}{n}.$$

Since $\Pr[u \in G_L, p \in H_L, v \in G_R, q \in H_R] \geq 1/32$ for $n \geq 2$ (Lemma B3), $\Pr[(u, p) \in M_L \wedge (v, q) \in M'_{\text{rand}}] \geq \frac{x_{up}^*}{32n}$. As M_L only use edges with $x_{up}^* > 0$ (i.e., $p \in \mathcal{L}(u)$), they are compatible. Consider compatible $M''_{\text{rand}} = M'_{\text{rand}} \cap E_{GH}$, yielding $\Pr[(u, p) \in M_L \wedge (v, q) \in M''_{\text{rand}}] \geq \frac{x_{up}^*}{32n}$ if $q \in \mathcal{L}(v)$, and 0 otherwise. Taking expectations,

$$\mathbb{E}[Obj'(M_L, M''_{\text{rand}})] \geq \frac{1}{32n} \sum_{u,v} w_G(u, v) \sum_p x_{up}^* \sum_{q \in \mathcal{L}(v)} w_H(p, q).$$

Restricting to $q \in \mathcal{L}(v) \cap \mathcal{W}_p$ and using $|\mathcal{L}(v) \cap \mathcal{W}_p| \geq \sqrt{n}$ gives

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{Obj}'(M_L, M''_{\text{rand}})] \geq \frac{1}{32n} \sum_{u,v} w_G(u,v) \sum_p x_{up}^* \left[\sqrt{n} \cdot \min_{q \in \mathcal{L}(v) \cap \mathcal{W}_p} w_H(p,q) \right].$$

Meanwhile, since $\sum_q y_{upvq}^* \leq x_{up}^*$, the quantity LP_2^* (which places mass on $q \in V_H \setminus \mathcal{W}_p$) is at most $\sum_{u,v} w_G(u,v) \sum_p x_{up}^* \left[\min_{q \in \mathcal{L}(v) \cap \mathcal{W}_p} w_H(p,q) \right]$. Hence, $\mathbb{E}[\text{Obj}'(M_L, M_R)] \geq \mathbb{E}[\text{Obj}'(M_L, M''_{\text{rand}})] \geq (\sqrt{n}/(32n)) LP_2^* = LP_2^*/O(\sqrt{n})$. \square

Whereas Lemma 1 uses M'_{rand} to bound LP_2^* , our analysis of LP_1^* employs a different auxiliary matching, M'_{star} , which leverages the set \mathcal{S}_R^p of each node p defined as follows. The details for this construction and the properties of the matching can be found in Appendix C.

Definition of M'_{star} . Define $l : V_H \rightarrow V_H$ by, for each $q \in V_H$, $l(q) \in \arg \max_{p \in V_H} \sum_{u,v \in V_G} w_G(u,v) w_H(p,q) y_{upvq}^*$. For $p \in V_H$, set $l^{-1}(p) := \{q \in V_H : l(q) = p\}$. Given subsets $H_L, H_R \subseteq V_H$, define for each $p \in H_L$, $\mathcal{S}_R^p := l^{-1}(p) \cap H_R$. We notice that for any distinct $p, p' \in H_L$, $\mathcal{S}_R^p \cap \mathcal{S}_R^{p'} = \emptyset$.

Given \mathcal{S}_R^p ($p \in H_L$), define for each p the matrix $Z_p = [z_{vq}^p]_{v \in G_R, q \in \mathcal{S}_R^p}$ by $z_{vq}^p = y_{\pi(p)pvq}/x_{\pi(p)p}$ if $\pi(p) \neq \perp$ and $z_{vq}^p = 0$ otherwise. Each Z_p is a fractional matching on $G_R \times \mathcal{S}_R^p$ (row/column sums ≤ 1), hence admits a convex decomposition $Z_p = \sum_{M \in \mathcal{M}_p} \alpha_M V_M$, where \mathcal{M}_p is the set of integral matchings on $G_R \times \mathcal{S}_R^p$ and, for each $M \in \mathcal{M}_p$, the matrix $V_M \in \{0,1\}^{G_R \times \mathcal{S}_R^p}$ (indexed by rows $v \in G_R$ and columns $q \in \mathcal{S}_R^p$) is the incidence (biadjacency) matrix of M , defined entrywise by $(V_M)_{vq} = 1$ if $(v,q) \in M$ and $(V_M)_{vq} = 0$ otherwise.

Sample one $M \in \mathcal{M}_p$ with probability α_M and define $\tau_p : \mathcal{S}_R^p \rightarrow G_R \cup \{\perp\}$ by $\tau_p(q) = v$ if $(v,q) \in M$ and $\tau_p(q) = \perp$ otherwise. Since the \mathcal{S}_R^p s are disjoint, the domains $\text{dom}(\tau_p)$ are disjoint, so we may set $\tau : H_R \rightarrow G_R \cup \{\perp\}$ by $\tau(q) = \tau_p(q)$ when $q \in \mathcal{S}_R^p$, and $\tau(q) = \perp$ otherwise. Finally, for each $v \in G_R$ with $\tau^{-1}(v) \neq \emptyset$, choose one $q \in \tau^{-1}(v)$ uniformly at random and include (v,q) in M'_{star} . The resulting set of edges M'_{star} is a matching on $G_R \times H_R$.

We obtain the following lemma, of which the full proof can be found in Appendix C, from the construction of M'_{star} .

Lemma 2. $\mathbb{E}[\text{Obj}'(M_L, M_R)] \geq LP_1^*/O(\sqrt{n})$.

Proof sketch. From the LP, $y_{upvq}^* = 0$ whenever $q \notin \mathcal{L}(v)$. Hence, in the convex decomposition $Z_p = \sum_{M \in \mathcal{M}_p} \alpha_M V_M$, any matching M containing a non-edge $(v,q) \notin E_{GH}$ must have $\alpha_M = 0$, so the sampled M'_{star} is compatible. (By construction, M_L is also compatible.) Taking expectations with the probability given by Lemma C3 and Lemma B3 provides $\mathbb{E}[\text{Obj}'(M_L, M'_{\text{star}})] \geq \frac{1}{128} \sum_{q \in V_H} \sum_{u,v \in V_G} y_{ul(q)vq}^* w_G(u,v) w_H(l(q),q)$. By definition of $l(q)$ as a maximizer over p , this is at least the average over $p \in \mathcal{W}_q$:

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{Obj}'(M_L, M'_{\text{star}})] \geq \frac{1}{128} \sum_q \frac{1}{|\mathcal{W}_q|} \sum_{p \in \mathcal{W}_q} \sum_{u,v} y_{upvq}^* w_G(u,v) w_H(p,q).$$

Finally, the facts $|\mathcal{W}_q| \leq \sqrt{n} + k + 1$ and $k \in O(\sqrt{n})$ give $\mathbb{E}[\text{Obj}'(M_L, M'_R)] \geq \mathbb{E}[\text{Obj}'(M_L, M'_{\text{star}})] \geq \frac{LP_1^*}{128(\sqrt{n}+k+1)} = \frac{LP_1^*}{O(\sqrt{n})}$. \square

We are now ready to demonstrate the main theorem of this section.

Theorem 1. *Algorithm 1 is an $O(\sqrt{n})$ -approximation algorithm for List-Restricted MaxQAP when $k = O(\sqrt{n})$.*

Proof. Assume that $k = O(\sqrt{n})$ and let M^* be an optimal solution of List-Restricted MaxQAP and $M = M_L \cup M_R$ be a matching given by Algorithm 1. Following Lemma 1 and Lemma 2, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{Obj}(M)] \geq \mathbb{E}[\text{Obj}'(M_L, M_R)] \geq \frac{LP_1^* + LP_2^*}{O(\sqrt{n})} = \frac{LP^*}{O(\sqrt{n})} \geq \frac{\text{Obj}(M^*)}{O(\sqrt{n})}.$$

\square

4 Approximation Algorithm for MaxQbAP

In this section, we present an approximation algorithm for dup-MaxQbAP. We again build a linear program on the MaxQAP integer formulation of Adams and Johnson [1]. Because each node may be paired with up to b nodes on the opposite side, the capacity constraint changes from $\sum_{u \in V_G} x_{up} = 1$ to $\sum_{u \in V_G} x_{up} = b$. For the same reason, we also impose $\sum_{p \in V_H} y_{upvq} = b x_{vq}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
(\text{Relaxed LP2}) \quad & \text{Maximize} \quad \sum_{u,v \in V_G} \sum_{p,q \in V_H} w_G(u,v) w_H(p,q) y_{upvq} \\
& \text{subject to} \quad \sum_{p \in V_H} x_{up} \leq b \quad \text{for all } u \in V_G; \\
& \quad \sum_{u \in V_G} x_{up} \leq b \quad \text{for all } p \in V_H; \\
& \quad \sum_{p \in V_H} y_{upvq} \leq b x_{vq} \quad \text{for all } u, v \in V_G \text{ and } q \in V_H; \\
& \quad \sum_{u \in V_G} y_{upvq} \leq b x_{vq} \quad \text{for all } v \in V_G \text{ and } p, q \in V_H; \\
& \quad y_{upvq} = y_{vqup} \quad \text{for all } u, v \in V_G \text{ and } p, q \in V_H; \\
& \quad x_{up} \in [0, 1] \quad \text{for all } u \in V_G \text{ and } p \in V_H; \\
& \quad y_{upvq} \in [0, 1] \quad \text{for all } u, v \in V_G \text{ and } p, q \in V_H.
\end{aligned}$$

Our algorithm for dup-MaxQbAP is as follows:

Algorithm 2:

Input: $G = (V_G, E_G, w_G)$ and $H = (V_H, E_H, w_H)$ such that $|V_G| = |V_H| = n$

Output: A b -matching bM between V_G and V_H

1. Solve Relaxed LP2 and obtain an optimal solution: $(x_{up}^*)_{u \in V_G, p \in V_H}$ and $(y_{upvq}^*)_{u,v \in V_G, p,q \in V_H}$.
2. Partition V_G randomly into G_L and G_R , such that $|G_L| = \lceil n/2 \rceil$ and $G_R = V_G \setminus G_L$. Do the same for V_H to obtain H_L and H_R .

3. For each $i = 1, 2, \dots, b$:
 - (a) For each $p \in H_L$, let p choose a node from $G_L \cup \{\perp\}$ with probability x_{up}^*/b for $u \in G_L$ and $1 - \sum_{u \in G_L} x_{up}^*/b$ for \perp . Then, define a function $\pi_i : H_L \rightarrow G_L \cup \{\perp\}$ such that $\pi_i(p)$ is the node that p have chosen.
 - (b) For each $u \in G_L$, let $\pi_i^{-1}(u)$ be a set of node $p \in H_L$ such that $\pi_i(p) = u$. For each $u \in G_L$ such that $\pi_i^{-1}(u) \neq \emptyset$, randomly choose an element p in $\pi_i^{-1}(u)$ and assign (u, p) to a matching $M_L^{(i)}$. Then add edges in E_{GH} between unmatched nodes in G_L and H_L to the matching $M_L^{(i)}$ at random, so that $M_L^{(i)}$ is a perfect matching between G_L and H_L .
4. Let ${}^bM_L = \bigcup_{i=1}^b M_L^{(i)}$.
5. For each $v \in G_R$ and $q \in H_R$, let $w(v, q) = \sum_{(u,p) \in {}^bM_L} w_G(u, v) w_H(p, q)$. Let bM_R be a maximum b -matching between G_R and H_R with respect to w . This b -matching can be obtained in polynomial time by using an algorithm for the maximum-weight b -matching problem (the maximum weight upper degree-constrained subgraph with unit capacity problem) proposed by Gabow [6].
6. Return ${}^bM = {}^bM_L \cup {}^bM_R$.

The proof can be done similarly to the proof of Algorithm 1. Let LP^* be an optimal value of Relaxed LP2 above. For each $p \in V_H$, let \mathcal{U}_p be the set of $\lceil \sqrt{n}/\sqrt{b} \rceil$ nodes in V_H whose weights of the edges from these nodes to p are the largest. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} LP^* &= \sum_{u,v \in V_G} \sum_{p,q \in V_H} w_G(u, v) w_H(p, q) y_{upvq}^* \\ &= \sum_{u,v \in V_G} \sum_{\substack{p \in V_H \\ q \in \mathcal{U}_p}} w_G(u, v) w_H(p, q) y_{upvq}^* + \sum_{u,v \in V_G} \sum_{\substack{p \in V_H \\ q \in V_H \setminus \mathcal{U}_p}} w_G(u, v) w_H(p, q) y_{upvq}^*. \end{aligned}$$

Denote the first sum as LP_1^* and the second sum as LP_2^* . Recall that ${}^bM = {}^bM_L \cup {}^bM_R$. Define

$$Obj'({}^bM_L, {}^bM_R) = \sum_{\substack{(u,p) \in {}^bM_L \\ (v,q) \in {}^bM_R}} w_G(u, v) w_H(p, q),$$

and evaluate Algorithm 2 using Obj' rather than the conventional $Obj({}^bM)$, as in the analysis of Algorithm 1. We then compare LP_2^* with the value achieved by Algorithm 2 via an argument parallel to the proof of Lemma 1, yielding the following lemma. We give the full proof the lemma in Appendix D.

Lemma 3. $\mathbb{E}[Obj'({}^bM_L, {}^bM_R)] \geq LP_2^*/O(\sqrt{bn})$.

Proof sketch. Consider b independent random matchings $M_{\text{rand}}^{(1)}, \dots, M_{\text{rand}}^{(b)}$ between G_R and H_R , and define ${}^bM'_{\text{rand}} := \bigcup_{i=1}^b M_{\text{rand}}^{(i)}$.

By Lemma B2, in each round i we have $\Pr[(u, p) \in M_L^{(i)} \mid u \in G_L, p \in H_L] \geq \frac{x_{up}^*}{2b}$, and $\Pr[(v, q) \in M_R^{(i)} \mid v \in G_R, q \in H_R] = \frac{1}{|G_R|} \geq \frac{2}{n}$. Since

the $2b$ events $\{(u, p) \in M_L^{(i)}\}$ and $\{(v, q) \in M_{\text{rand}}'^{(i)}\}$ are mutually independent, $\Pr[(u, p) \in {}^bM_L \text{ and } (v, q) \in {}^bM_{\text{rand}}'] = (1 - \Pr[(u, p) \notin {}^bM_L])(1 - \Pr[(v, q) \notin {}^bM_{\text{rand}}'])$. Since

$$\Pr[(u, p) \notin {}^bM_L] \leq \left(1 - \frac{x_{up}^*}{2b}\right)^b, \quad \Pr[(v, q) \notin {}^bM_{\text{rand}}'] \leq \left(1 - \frac{2}{n}\right)^b,$$

we apply $1 + x \leq e^x$ and $1 - e^{-x} \geq (1 - 1/e)x$ (for $0 \leq x \leq 1$) to obtain

$$\Pr[(u, p) \in {}^bM_L \text{ and } (v, q) \in {}^bM_{\text{rand}}'] \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{e}\right)^2 \cdot \frac{bx_{up}^*}{n}.$$

Lemma B3 shows that the additional randomness from the partition into G_L, G_R, H_L, H_R only incurs a further constant-factor loss, so there exists $c_1 = \frac{32}{(1-1/e)^2}$ such that $\Pr[(u, p) \in {}^bM_L \text{ and } (v, q) \in {}^bM_{\text{rand}}'] \geq \frac{bx_{up}^*}{c_1 n}$ for all u, v, p, q .

By linearity of expectation, this probability bound yields a lower bound on $\mathbb{E}[\text{Obj}'({}^bM_L, {}^bM_{\text{rand}}')]$ in terms of the LP solution. Using the fact that $|\mathcal{U}_p| \geq \sqrt{n}/\sqrt{b}$ and the constraint $\sum_{q \in V_H} y_{upvq}^* \leq bx_{up}^*$, one can extract a factor \sqrt{n}/\sqrt{b} and show

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{Obj}'({}^bM_L, {}^bM_{\text{rand}}')] \geq \frac{1}{c_1 \sqrt{bn}} \sum_{u, v \in V_G} \sum_{\substack{p \in V_H \\ q \in V_H \setminus \mathcal{U}_p}} w_G(u, v) w_H(p, q) y_{upvq}^* = \frac{LP_2^*}{c_1 \sqrt{bn}}.$$

Finally, we obtain that $\mathbb{E}[\text{Obj}'({}^bM_L, {}^bM_R)] \geq \mathbb{E}[\text{Obj}'({}^bM_L, {}^bM_{\text{rand}}')] \geq \frac{LP_2^*}{c_1 \sqrt{bn}} = \frac{LP_2^*}{O(\sqrt{bn})}$. \square

In the next lemma, we discuss the relationship between our objective values and LP_1^* . We give the full proof the lemma in Appendix E.

Lemma 4. $\mathbb{E}[\text{Obj}'({}^bM_L, {}^bM_R)] \geq LP_1^*/O(\sqrt{bn})$.

Proof sketch. We scale $x_{up} := \frac{x_{up}^*}{b}$, $y_{upvq} := \frac{y_{upvq}^*}{b^2}$, and run Algorithm C for b independent iterations using these scaled values. Let $M_{\text{star}}'^{(i)}$ be the matching produced in round i , and set ${}^bM_{\text{star}}' := \bigcup_{i=1}^b M_{\text{star}}'^{(i)}$.

By Lemma C3, conditioned on $u \in G_L$, $p \in H_L$, $v \in G_R$ and $q \in \mathcal{S}_R^p$ (with $\mathcal{S}_R^p = l^{-1}(p) \cap H_R$), each iteration satisfies

$$\Pr[(u, p) \in M_L'^{(i)} \text{ and } (v, q) \in M_{\text{star}}'^{(i)}] \geq \frac{y_{upvq}^*}{4b^2}.$$

The fact that b iterations are independent gives

$$\Pr[(u, p) \in {}^bM_L' \text{ and } (v, q) \in {}^bM_{\text{star}}'] \geq 1 - \left(1 - \frac{y_{upvq}^*}{4b^2}\right)^b.$$

Applying the standard bound $1 - e^{-x} \geq (1 - 1/e)x$ for $0 \leq x \leq 1$ yields

$$\Pr[(u, p) \in {}^bM_L' \text{ and } (v, q) \in {}^bM_{\text{star}}'] \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{e}\right) \cdot \frac{y_{upvq}^*}{4b}.$$

Hence, there exists a constant $c_2 := \frac{128}{1-1/e}$ such that, for any $u, v \in V_G$ and $p, q \in V_H$, $\Pr[(u, p) \in {}^bM_L \text{ and } (v, q) \in {}^bM'_{\text{star}} \mid p = l(q)] \geq \frac{y_{upvq}^*}{c_2 b}$ and $\Pr[(u, p) \in {}^bM'_L \text{ and } (v, q) \in {}^bM'_{\text{star}} \mid p \neq l(q)] = 0$.

Using the same averaging argument as in the proof of Lemma 2, together with the fact that $1/|\mathcal{U}_q| \geq \sqrt{b}/(2\sqrt{n})$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{Obj}'({}^bM'_L, {}^bM'_{\text{star}})] \geq \frac{1}{O(\sqrt{bn})} \sum_{u,v \in V_G} \sum_{\substack{q \in V_H \\ p \in \mathcal{U}_q}} w_G(u, v) w_H(p, q) y_{upvq}^* = \frac{LP_1^*}{O(\sqrt{bn})}.$$

$$\text{Finally, } \mathbb{E}[\text{Obj}'({}^bM_L, {}^bM_R)] \geq \mathbb{E}[\text{Obj}'({}^bM'_L, {}^bM'_{\text{star}})] \geq \frac{LP_1^*}{O(\sqrt{bn})}. \quad \square$$

Finally, we consider the approximation ratio of Algorithm 2 and conclude as the following theorem.

Theorem 2. *Algorithm 2 is an $O(\sqrt{bn})$ -approximation algorithm for dup-MaxQbAP , and hence, an $O(\sqrt{bn})$ -approximation algorithm for MaxQbAP .*

Proof. Let ${}^bM^*$ be an optimal solution of MaxQbAP and ${}^bM = {}^bM_L \cup {}^bM_R$ be a matching given by Algorithm 2. Following Lemma 3 and Lemma 4, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{Obj}({}^bM)] \geq \mathbb{E}[\text{Obj}'({}^bM_L, {}^bM_R)] \geq \frac{LP_1^* + LP_2^*}{O(\sqrt{bn})} = \frac{LP^*}{O(\sqrt{bn})} \geq \frac{\text{Obj}({}^bM^*)}{O(\sqrt{bn})}.$$

\square

5 Conclusion

While MaxQAP has been extensively studied due to its wide range of applications, its variants have received significantly less attention in the literature. In particular, to the best of our knowledge, no prior work has addressed approximation algorithms for any variant of MaxQAP. To initiate progress in this direction, we investigate two natural variants: MaxQAP with list restrictions and the Maximum Quadratic b -Matching Problem (MaxQbAP). Since both problems can be reduced to MaxQAP, they inherit its NP-hardness.

Using the randomized rounding technique from [15], we develop approximation algorithms for both variants. Our approximation ratio asymptotically matches the best-known ratio for MaxQAP when each nodes restricted list has size $n - O(\sqrt{n})$ and $b \in O(1)$, suggesting that improving this ratio may require fundamentally new techniques.

References

1. William P. Adams and Thomas A. Johnson. A linear programming approach to the quadratic assignment problem. *Computers & Operations Research*, 21(2):199–210, 1994.

2. Sebastien Bogleux, Luc Brun, Vincenzo Carletti, Pasquale Foggia, Benoit Gauzere, and Mario Vento. Graph edit distance as a quadratic assignment problem. *Pattern Recognition Letters*, 87:38–46, 2017.
3. Siraphob Buahong, Vorapong Suppakitpaisarn, and Piyashat Sripratak. Finding a b -matching that embeds the maximum number of edge pairs in a given set. *Journal of Combinatorial Optimization*, 49(5):1–15, 2025.
4. Erdőbet Çela. *The Quadratic Assignment Problem: Theory and Algorithms*, volume 1 of *Combinatorial Optimization*. Springer, 1998.
5. Philippe Codognet, Daniel Diaz, and Salvador Abreu. Quantum and digital annealing for the quadratic assignment problem. In *QSW'22*, pages 1–8, 2022.
6. Harold N. Gabow. An efficient reduction technique for degree-constrained subgraph and bidirected network flow problems. In *Proceedings of the Fifteenth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC '83, pages 448–456. ACM, 1983.
7. Martin Grohe, Gaurav Rattan, and Gerhard J Woeginger. Graph similarity and approximate isomorphism. In *MFCS'18*, 2018.
8. Pavel Klavík, Dušan Knop, and Peter Zeman. Graph isomorphism restricted by lists. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 860:51–71, 2021.
9. Peter Kleinschmidt and Heinz Schannath. A strongly polynomial algorithm for the transportation problem. *Mathematical Programming*, 68(1):1–13, 1995.
10. Tjalling C. Koopmans and Martin Beckmann. Assignment problems and the location of economic activities. *Econometrica*, 25(1):53–76, 1957.
11. Chung-Yee Lee and Zi-Xing Ma. A generalized assignment problem for hub network design with fixed cost. *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, 55(10):1085–1092, 2004.
12. Marius Leordeanu and Martial Hebert. A spectral technique for correspondence problems using pairwise constraints. In *ICCV'05*, pages 1482–1489, 2005.
13. László Lovász and Michael D. Plummer. *Matching theory*, volume 367. American Mathematical Soc., 2009.
14. Anna Lubiw. Some NP-complete problems similar to graph isomorphism. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 10(1):11–21, 1981.
15. Konstantin Makarychev, Rajsekar Manokaran, and Maxim Sviridenko. Maximum quadratic assignment problem: Reduction from maximum label cover and LP-based approximation algorithm. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms (TALG)*, 10(4):1–18, 2014.
16. Arthur R McKendall and Wenzhu Li. Heuristics for the generalized quadratic assignment problem with side constraints. *Computers & Operations Research*, 88:98–109, 2017.
17. Viswanath Nagarajan and Maxim Sviridenko. On the maximum quadratic assignment problem. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 34(4):859–868, 2009.
18. Cam Ly Nguyen, Vorapong Suppakitpaisarn, Athasit Surarerks, and Phanu Vajanopath. On the maximum edge-pair embedding bipartite matching. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 882:109–124, 2021.
19. Panos M. Pardalos and Henry Wolkowicz. Quadratic assignment and related problems. *DIMACS Series in Discrete Mathematics and Theoretical Computer Science*, 16:1–42, 1994.
20. Vijay V Vazirani. Online bipartite matching and adwords. In *MFCS'22*, 2022.
21. Xinyu Ye, Ge Yan, and Junchi Yan. Towards quantum machine learning for constrained combinatorial optimization: a quantum QAP solver. In *ICML'23*, pages 39903–39912. PMLR, 2023.
22. Feng Zhou and Fernando De la Torre. Factorized graph matching. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 38(9):1774–1789, 2015.

A Relationship between MaxQbAP and dup-MaxQbAP

Since MaxQbAP differs from dup-MaxQbAP only in the objective function, we can use the same approximation algorithm on both problems with the only difference in the approximation ratios, as stated in the following lemma.

Lemma A1. *An α -approximation algorithm for dup-MaxQbAP is a 2α -approximation algorithm for MaxQbAP.*

Proof. Let Obj and Obj_{dup} denote the objective functions of MaxQbAP and dup-MaxQbAP, respectively. Given an instance of MaxQbAP, we first observe that in dup-MaxQbAP, each pair of edge weights $w_G(u, v)w_H(p, q)$ for $\{u, v\} \in E_G$ and $\{p, q\} \in E_H$ can appear in the objective function at most twice; one when $(u, p), (v, q) \in {}^bM$ and the other when $(u, q), (v, p) \in {}^bM$. Furthermore, for any b -matching bM , we know that the pair $w_G(u, v)w_H(p, q)$ is in the objective function of MaxQbAP for bM if and only if it is in the objective function of dup-MaxQbAP (can be once or twice). Thus, we have

$$Obj_{dup}({}^bM) \geq Obj({}^bM) \geq \frac{Obj_{dup}({}^bM)}{2}$$

for any b -matching bM between V_G and V_H . Let Opt be the optimal value given by an optimal solution ${}^bM^*$ of MaxQbAP, and let Opt_{dup} be the optimal value of dup-MaxQbAP on this instance. Assume that we have an α -approximation algorithm for dup-MaxQbAP. Then we can find a b -matching ${}^bM_{Sol}$ such that $Obj_{dup}({}^bM_{Sol}) \geq Opt_{dup}/\alpha$. Hence, we obtain the following:

$$Obj({}^bM_{Sol}) \geq \frac{Obj_{dup}({}^bM_{Sol})}{2} \geq \frac{Opt_{dup}}{2\alpha} \geq \frac{Obj_{dup}({}^bM^*)}{2\alpha} \geq \frac{Obj({}^bM^*)}{2\alpha} = \frac{Opt}{2\alpha}.$$

□

B Proof of Lemma 1

We first give a lemma which we have used for proving Lemma 1.

Lemma B1 (Lemma 5.1 of [18]). *Let S be a random subset of a set V and let $v \in V$. Assume that for all $s, s' \in V$ such that $s \neq s'$, the event that $s \in S$ is independent to the event that $s' \in S$. If we pick an element from S at random, the probability of having v as the chosen element is at least $\Pr[v \in S]/(\mathbb{E}[|S|] + 1)$.*

Then, we formally define how we construct the matching M'_{rand} in the following algorithm.

Algorithm B:

Input: Pairwisely disjoint sets of nodes G_L, G_R, H_L, H_R such that $|G_L| = |H_L|$ and $|G_R| = |H_R|$, $x_{up} \in [0, 1]$ for each $u \in G_L$ and $p \in H_L$ such that

$$\sum_{u \in G_L} x_{up} \leq 1 \text{ for all } p \in H_L \text{ and } \sum_{p \in H_L} x_{up} \leq 1 \text{ for all } u \in G_L$$

Output: Two matchings: M_L between G_L and H_R and M'_{rand} between G_R and H_R

1. For each $p \in H_L$, choose a node from $G_L \cup \{\perp\}$ with probability x_{up} for $u \in G_L$ and $1 - \sum_{u \in G_L} x_{up}$ for \perp . Then, define a function $\pi : H_L \rightarrow G_L \cup \{\perp\}$ such that $\pi(p)$ is the chosen node for each p .
2. For each $u \in G_L$, let $\pi^{-1}(u)$ be the set of node $p \in H_L$ such that $\pi(p) = u$. For each $u \in G_L$ such that $\pi^{-1}(u) \neq \emptyset$, randomly choose an element p in $\pi^{-1}(u)$ and assign (u, p) to a matching M_L .
3. Construct a random matching M'_{rand} between the set G_R and the set H_R .
4. Return M_L and M'_{rand} .

Lemma B2. *If we proceed according to Algorithm B with the required input, then for $u \in G_L, p \in H_L, v \in G_R, q \in H_R$, we have*

$$\Pr[(u, p) \in M_L] \geq x_{up}/2$$

as well as

$$\Pr[(v, q) \in M'_{\text{rand}}] \geq 1/|G_R|;$$

and consequently,

$$\Pr[(u, p) \in M_L \text{ and } (v, q) \in M'_{\text{rand}}] \geq x_{up}/(2|G_R|).$$

Proof. Let $u \in G_L$ and $p \in H_L$. Following the construction of the function π and the condition of the input, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[|\pi^{-1}(u)|] = \sum_{p \in H_L} \Pr[\pi(p) = u] = \sum_{p \in H_L} x_{up} \leq 1.$$

Moreover, for $p, p' \in H_L$ such that $p \neq p'$, the event that $p \in \pi^{-1}(u)$ is independent to the event that $p' \in \pi^{-1}(u)$. Thus, by Lemma B1, we then have

$$\Pr[(u, p) \in M_L] \geq \frac{\Pr[p \in \pi^{-1}(u)]}{\mathbb{E}[|\pi^{-1}(u)|] + 1} \geq \frac{\Pr[\pi(p) = u]}{2} = \frac{x_{up}}{2}.$$

On the other hand, for $v \in G_R$ and $q \in H_R$, we have $\Pr[(v, q) \in M'_{\text{rand}}] = 1/|G_R|$ as M'_{rand} is a random matching. Given that $u \in G_L, p \in H_L, v \in G_R, q \in H_R$, since the event that $(u, p) \in M_L$ and the event that $(v, q) \in M'_{\text{rand}}$ are independent, we therefore obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[(u, p) \in M_L \text{ and } (v, q) \in M'_{\text{rand}}] &= \Pr[(u, p) \in M_L] \cdot \Pr[(v, q) \in M'_{\text{rand}}] \\ &\geq \frac{x_{up}}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{|G_R|} = \frac{x_{up}}{2|G_R|}. \end{aligned}$$

□

In the above lemma, the probability is considered when the sets G_L, G_R, H_L, H_R are given. However, in both Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2, these sets are random. Thus, we state the following lemma.

Lemma B3. *Let G_L, G_R, H_L, H_R be randomly chosen as defined in Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2 and let A be an event of nodes $u, v \in V_G$ and $p, q \in V_H$ that occurs only if $u \in G_L, p \in H_L, v \in G_R, q \in H_R$. Then*

$$\Pr[A] \geq \frac{\Pr[A|u \in G_L, p \in H_L, v \in G_R, q \in H_R]}{32}.$$

Proof. Following the definitions of G_L, H_L, G_R , and H_R , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[u \in G_L, p \in H_L, v \in G_R, q \in H_R] &= \left(\frac{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor \lceil n/2 \rceil}{n^2} \right)^2 \\ &\geq \left(\frac{(n+1)(n-1)}{4n^2} \right)^2 \\ &= \frac{n^4 - 2n^2 + 1}{16n^4} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{32} \end{aligned}$$

when $n \geq 2$. With the condition of the event A , we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[A] &= \Pr[A|u \in G_L, p \in H_L, v \in G_R, q \in H_R] \\ &\quad \cdot \Pr[u \in G_L, p \in H_L, v \in G_R, q \in H_R] \\ &\geq \frac{\Pr[A|u \in G_L, p \in H_L, v \in G_R, q \in H_R]}{32}. \end{aligned}$$

□

We are now ready to demonstrate Lemma 1.

Proof (Proof of Lemma 1). Given G_L, H_L, G_R, H_R and x_{up}^* from step 1 and 2 of Algorithm 1, we proceed according to Algorithm B using the corresponding sets and $x_{up} = x_{up}^*$ for each $u \in G_L$ and $p \in H_L$. By Lemma B2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[(u, p) \in M_L \text{ and } (v, q) \in M'_{\text{rand}} | u \in G_L, p \in H_L, v \in G_R, q \in H_R] \\ &\geq \frac{x_{up}^*}{2|G_R|} \\ &\geq \frac{x_{up}^*}{2} \cdot \frac{2}{n} \\ &= \frac{x_{up}^*}{n}. \end{aligned}$$

Since the event “ $(u, p) \in M_L$ and $(v, q) \in M'_{\text{rand}}$ ” can occur only if $u \in G_L, p \in H_L, v \in G_R, q \in H_R$, by Lemma B3, we then have

$$\Pr[(u, p) \in M_L \text{ and } (v, q) \in M'_{\text{rand}}] \geq \frac{x_{up}^*}{n} \cdot \frac{1}{32} = \frac{x_{up}^*}{32n}.$$

Note that in the construction of M_L , the edge (u, p) when $u \in G_L$ and $p \in H_L$ can be chosen only if $x_{up}^* > 0$, i.e., $p \in \mathcal{L}(u)$. Thus, M_L is compatible. However,

for M'_{rand} , any edges can be included in the matching. Hence, we consider the matching $M''_{\text{rand}} = M'_{\text{rand}} \cap E_{GH}$ so that M''_{rand} is compatible. With this definition of M''_{rand} , we then have $\Pr[(u, p) \in M_L \text{ and } (v, q) \in M''_{\text{rand}}] \geq x_{up}^*/32n$ if $q \in \mathcal{L}(v)$, and equals to 0 otherwise. Therefore, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}[\text{Obj}'(M_L, M_R)] \\
& \geq \mathbb{E}[\text{Obj}'(M_L, M''_{\text{rand}})] \\
& = \sum_{u,v \in V_G} \sum_{p,q \in V_H} \Pr[(u, p) \in M_L \text{ and } (v, q) \in M''_{\text{rand}}] w_G(u, v) w_H(p, q) \\
& = \sum_{u,v \in V_G} \sum_{\substack{p \in V_H \\ q \in \mathcal{L}(v)}} \Pr[(u, p) \in M_L \text{ and } (v, q) \in M''_{\text{rand}}] w_G(u, v) w_H(p, q) \\
& \geq \sum_{u,v \in V_G} \sum_{\substack{p \in V_H \\ q \in \mathcal{L}(v)}} \frac{x_{up}^*}{32n} w_G(u, v) w_H(p, q) \\
& = \frac{1}{32n} \sum_{u,v \in V_G} w_G(u, v) \sum_{p \in V_H} x_{up}^* \sum_{q \in \mathcal{L}(v)} w_H(p, q) \\
& \geq \frac{1}{32n} \sum_{u,v \in V_G} w_G(u, v) \sum_{p \in V_H} x_{up}^* \sum_{q \in \mathcal{L}(v) \cap \mathcal{W}_p} w_H(p, q) \\
& \geq \frac{1}{32n} \sum_{u,v \in V_G} w_G(u, v) \sum_{p \in V_H} x_{up}^* \left[\sqrt{n} \min_{q \in \mathcal{L}(v) \cap \mathcal{W}_p} w_H(p, q) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

The last inequality follows from the fact that $|\mathcal{L}(v) \cap \mathcal{W}_p| = |\mathcal{W}_p \setminus \mathcal{L}(v)^C| \geq |\mathcal{W}_p| - |\mathcal{L}(v)^C| \geq \sqrt{n} + k - k = \sqrt{n}$ for all $v \in V_G$ and $p \in V_H$. On the other hand, since $\sum_{q \in V_H} y_{upvq}^* \leq x_{up}^*$ for all $u, v \in V_G$ and $p \in V_H$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
LP_2^* & = \sum_{u,v \in V_G} \sum_{\substack{p \in V_H \\ q \in V_H \setminus \mathcal{W}_p}} w_G(u, v) w_H(p, q) y_{upvq}^* \\
& = \sum_{u,v \in V_G} w_G(u, v) \sum_{p \in V_H} \sum_{q \in \mathcal{L}(v) \cap (V_H \setminus \mathcal{W}_p)} w_H(p, q) y_{upvq}^* \\
& \leq \sum_{u,v \in V_G} w_G(u, v) \sum_{p \in V_H} \sum_{q \in \mathcal{L}(v) \cap (V_H \setminus \mathcal{W}_p)} \left[\max_{q \in \mathcal{L}(v) \cap (V_H \setminus \mathcal{W}_p)} w_H(p, q) \right] y_{upvq}^* \\
& \leq \sum_{u,v \in V_G} w_G(u, v) \sum_{p \in V_H} \left[\max_{q \in \mathcal{L}(v) \cap (V_H \setminus \mathcal{W}_p)} w_H(p, q) \right] \sum_{q \in V_H} y_{upvq}^* \\
& \leq \sum_{u,v \in V_G} w_G(u, v) \sum_{p \in V_H} \left[\max_{q \in \mathcal{L}(v) \cap (V_H \setminus \mathcal{W}_p)} w_H(p, q) \right] x_{up}^* \\
& \leq \sum_{u,v \in V_G} w_G(u, v) \sum_{p \in V_H} \left[\min_{q \in \mathcal{L}(v) \cap \mathcal{W}_p} w_H(p, q) \right] x_{up}^*.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have $\mathbb{E}[\text{Obj}'(M_L, M_R)] \geq \sqrt{n} \cdot LP_2^*/(32n) = LP_2^*/O(\sqrt{n})$. \square

C Proof of Lemma 2

Recall the function $l : V_H \rightarrow V_H$ defined by, for each $q \in V_H$,

$$l(q) \in \arg \max_{p \in V_H} \sum_{u, v \in V_G} w_G(u, v) w_H(p, q) y_{upvq}^*.$$

From this function, if the subsets $H_L, H_R \subseteq V_H$ are given, we define $\mathcal{S}_R^p := l^{-1}(p) \cap H_R$ for each $p \in H_L$ (we have $\mathcal{S}_R^p \cap \mathcal{S}_R^{p'} = \emptyset$ for any distinct $p, p' \in H_L$) and then construct a matching M'_{star} . The detailed construction of the matching M'_{star} is described in the following algorithm.

Algorithm C:

Input: Pairwise disjoint sets of nodes G_L, G_R, H_L, H_R such that $|G_L| = |H_L|$ and $|G_R| = |H_R|$, a set $\mathcal{S}_R^p \subseteq H_R$ for each $p \in H_L$ such that $\mathcal{S}_R^p \cap \mathcal{S}_R^{p'} = \emptyset$ for all $p \neq p'$, $x_{up} \in [0, 1]$ for each $u \in G_L$ and $p \in H_L$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{u \in H_L} x_{up} \leq 1 \text{ for all } p \in H_L \text{ and } \sum_{p \in H_L} x_{up} \leq 1 \text{ for all } u \in G_L, \\ & x_{vq} \in [0, 1] \text{ for each } v \in G_R \text{ and } q \in H_R \text{ such that} \\ & \sum_{v \in G_R} x_{vq} \leq 1 \text{ for all } q \in H_R \text{ and } \sum_{q \in H_R} x_{vq} \leq 1 \text{ for all } v \in G_R, \\ & y_{upvq} \in [0, 1] \text{ for each } u \in G_L, v \in G_R, p \in H_L \text{ and } q \in H_R \text{ such that} \\ & \sum_{u \in G_L} y_{upvq} \leq x_{vq} \text{ for all } v \in G_R, p \in H_L \text{ and } q \in H_R, \\ & \sum_{p \in H_L} y_{upvq} \leq x_{vq} \text{ for all } u \in G_L, v \in G_R \text{ and } q \in H_R, \\ & \sum_{v \in G_R} y_{upvq} \leq x_{up} \text{ for all } u \in G_L, p \in H_L \text{ and } q \in H_R, \\ & \sum_{q \in H_R} y_{upvq} \leq x_{up} \text{ for all } u \in G_L, v \in G_R \text{ and } p \in H_L \end{aligned}$$

Output: Two matchings: M_L between G_L and H_L and M'_{star} between G_R and H_R

1. For each $p \in H_L$, choose a node from $G_L \cup \{\perp\}$ with probability x_{up} for $u \in G_L$ and $1 - \sum_{u \in G_L} x_{up}$ for \perp . Then, define a function $\pi : H_L \rightarrow G_L \cup \{\perp\}$ such that $\pi(p)$ is the chosen node for each p .
2. For each $u \in G_L$, let $\pi^{-1}(u)$ be the set of node $p \in H_L$ such that $\pi(p) = u$. For each $u \in G_L$ such that $\pi^{-1}(u) \neq \emptyset$, randomly choose an element p in $\pi^{-1}(u)$ and assign (u, p) to a matching M_L .
3. For each $p \in H_L$, $q \in \mathcal{S}_R^p$, and $v \in G_R$, let $z_{vq}^p = y_{\pi(p)p v q} / x_{\pi(p)p}$ if $\pi(p) \neq \perp$, and $z_{vq}^p = 0$ otherwise.
4. For each $p \in H_L$, consider $Z_p = [z_{vq}^p]_{v \in G_R, q \in \mathcal{S}_R^p}$ as a partial matching between G_R and \mathcal{S}_R^p (Lemma C1). Let \mathcal{M}_p be the set of all matchings between

G_R and \mathcal{S}_R^p . Then Z_p can be written as a convex combination of matchings in \mathcal{M}_p (Theorem 7.1.2 of [13]), i.e., $Z_p = \sum_{M \in \mathcal{M}_p} \alpha_M V_M$ where V_M is a vector representation of $M \in \mathcal{M}_p$: $[\delta_{vq}^M]_{v \in G_R, q \in \mathcal{S}_R^p}$ where $\delta_{vq}^M = 1$ if $(v, q) \in M$ and $\delta_{vq}^M = 0$ otherwise; and $\alpha_M \in [0, 1]$ such that $\sum_{M \in \mathcal{M}_p} \alpha_M \leq 1$. Choose one of those matchings with the probability equals to its α_M . Then, define a function $\tau_p : \mathcal{S}_R^p \rightarrow G_R \cup \{\perp\}$ following the chosen matching M such that $\tau_p(q) = v$ if $(v, q) \in M$ and $\tau_p(q) = \perp$ if q is not incident to any edges in M . Note that $\text{dom}(\tau_p) \cap \text{dom}(\tau_{p'}) = \emptyset$ for any $p \neq p'$.

5. Define a function $\tau : H_R \rightarrow G_R \cup \{\perp\}$ such that for each $q \in H_R$, $\tau(q) = \tau_p(q)$ if $q \in \mathcal{S}_R^p$ for some $p \in H_L$ and $\tau(q) = \perp$ otherwise.
6. For each $v \in G_R$, let $\tau^{-1}(v)$ be the set of node $q \in H_R$ such that $\tau(q) = v$. For each $v \in G_R$ such that $\tau^{-1}(v) \neq \emptyset$, randomly choose a node $q \in \tau^{-1}(v)$ and assign (v, q) to the matching M'_{star} .
7. Return M_L and M'_{star} .

We first establish the following lemma: the matrix $Z_p = [z_{vq}^p]_{v \in G_R, q \in \mathcal{S}_R^p}$ arising in the construction is a partial matching (i.e., every row and column sum is at most 1). We then invoke this property to carry out Step 3 of the construction.

Lemma C1. *Given the input of Algorithm C, for each $p \in H_L$, the matrix $Z_p = [z_{vq}^p]_{v \in G_R, q \in \mathcal{S}_R^p}$ constructed following Algorithm C is a partial matching between G_R and \mathcal{S}_R^p .*

Proof. Let $p \in H_L$. Following the condition of the input and the definition of z_{vq}^p ,

$$\sum_{q \in \mathcal{S}_R^p} z_{vq}^p = \sum_{q \in \mathcal{S}_R^p} \frac{y_{\pi(p)p} v q}{x_{\pi(p)p}} \leq \sum_{q \in H_R} \frac{y_{\pi(p)p} v q}{x_{\pi(p)p}} \leq \frac{x_{\pi(p)p}}{x_{\pi(p)p}} = 1$$

and

$$\sum_{v \in G_R} z_{vq}^p = \sum_{v \in G_R} \frac{y_{\pi(p)p} v q}{x_{\pi(p)p}} \leq \frac{x_{\pi(p)p}}{x_{\pi(p)p}} = 1$$

which imply that $Z_p = [z_{vq}^p]_{v \in G_R, q \in \mathcal{S}_R^p}$ is a partial matching between G_R and \mathcal{S}_R^p . \square

The following lemma is leveraged to demonstrate Lemma 2.

Lemma C2 (Lemma 5.3 of [18]). *Let S be a random subset of a set V and T be a random subset of a set W , and let $(v, w) \in V \times W$. Assume that for all $s, s' \in V$ and $t, t' \in W$ such that $s \neq s'$ and $t \neq t'$, the event that $s \in S$ and the event that $t \in T$ are independent to the event that $(s', t') \in S \times T$. If we pick an element from $S \times T$ at random, the probability of having (v, w) as the chosen element is at least $\Pr[(v, w) \in S \times T] / ((\mathbb{E}[|S|] + 1) \cdot (\mathbb{E}[|T|] + 1))$.*

The following lemma follows from Lemma C2.

Lemma C3. *If we proceed according to Algorithm C with the required input, then for $u \in G_L, p \in H_L, v \in G_R, q \in \mathcal{S}_R^p$, we have $\Pr[(u, p) \in M_L \text{ and } (v, q) \in M'_{\text{star}}] \geq y_{upvq}/4$.*

Proof. Let $p \in H_L$. By Lemma C1 and Theorem 7.1.2 of [13], we know that $Z_p = [z_{vq}^p]_{v \in G_R, q \in \mathcal{S}_R^p}$ is a convex combination of matchings between G_R and \mathcal{S}_R^p . Let \mathcal{M}_p denote the set of all matchings M between G_R and \mathcal{S}_R^p , each written in a vector representation: $V_M = [\delta_{vq}^M]_{v \in G_R, q \in \mathcal{S}_R^p}$ where $\delta_{vq}^M = 1$ if $(v, q) \in M$ and $\delta_{vq}^M = 0$ otherwise. We then have $Z_p = \sum_{M \in \mathcal{M}_p} \alpha_M V_M$ where α_M is a nonnegative real number, and $\sum_{M \in \mathcal{M}_p} \alpha_M \leq 1$. Hence, for each $v \in G_R$ and $q \in \mathcal{S}_R^p$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[\tau(q) = v | \pi(p) = u] &= \Pr[\tau_p(q) = v | \pi(p) = u] \\ &= \sum_{M \in \mathcal{M}_p: (v, q) \in M} \alpha_M \\ &= \sum_{M \in \mathcal{M}_p} \alpha_M \delta_{vq}^M \\ &= z_{vq}^p. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\Pr[\tau(q) = v | \pi(p) = u] = y_{upvq}/x_{up}$ if $\pi(p) = u \in G_L$, and $\Pr[\tau(q) = v | \pi(p) = \perp] = 0$ by the definition of z_{vq}^p . Therefore, for each $v \in G_R$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|\tau^{-1}(v)|] &= \sum_{p \in H_L} \sum_{q \in \mathcal{S}_R^p} \Pr[\tau(q) = v] \\ &= \sum_{p \in H_L} \sum_{q \in \mathcal{S}_R^p} \sum_{u \in G_L} \Pr[\tau(q) = v | \pi(p) = u] \cdot \Pr[\pi(p) = u] \\ &= \sum_{p \in H_L} \sum_{q \in \mathcal{S}_R^p} \sum_{u \in G_L} \frac{y_{upvq}}{x_{up}} \cdot x_{up} \\ &= \sum_{p \in H_L} \sum_{q \in \mathcal{S}_R^p} \sum_{u \in G_L} y_{upvq} \\ &= \sum_{q \in \bigcup_{p \in H_L} \mathcal{S}_R^p} \sum_{u \in G_L} y_{up_q v q} \\ &\leq \sum_{q \in H_R} x_{vq} \\ &\leq 1 \end{aligned}$$

where p_q is a node $p \in H_L$ whose \mathcal{S}_R^p contains q . Recall that, in the proof of Lemma B2, for each $u \in G_L$, we have $\mathbb{E}[|\pi^{-1}(u)|] \leq 1$ for this construction of π . Moreover, for $p, p' \in H_L$ and $q, q' \in H_R$ such that $p \neq p'$ and $q \neq q'$, the event that $p \in \pi^{-1}(u)$ and the event that $q \in \tau^{-1}(v)$ are independent to the event that $(p', q') \in \pi^{-1}(u) \times \tau^{-1}(v)$. Hence, given that $u \in G_L, p \in H_L, v \in G_R, q \in \mathcal{S}_R^p$,

by Lemma C2, we then get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Pr[(u, p) \in M_L \text{ and } (v, q) \in M'_{\text{star}}] \\
& \geq \frac{\Pr[p \in \pi^{-1}(u) \text{ and } q \in \tau^{-1}(v)]}{(\mathbb{E}[|\pi^{-1}(u)|] + 1)(\mathbb{E}[|\tau^{-1}(v)|] + 1)} \\
& \geq \frac{1}{4} \cdot \Pr[p \in \pi^{-1}(u)] \cdot \Pr[q \in \tau^{-1}(v) | p \in \pi^{-1}(u)] \\
& = \frac{1}{4} \cdot \Pr[\pi(p) = u] \cdot \Pr[\tau(q) = v | \pi(p) = u] \\
& = \frac{1}{4} \cdot x_{up} \cdot \frac{y_{upvq}}{x_{up}} \\
& = \frac{y_{upvq}}{4}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

We are now ready to formally prove Lemma 2.

Proof (Proof of Lemma 2). Given $G_L, H_L, G_R, H_R, x_{up}^*$, and y_{upvq}^* . Construct for each $p \in H_L$ a set \mathcal{S}_R^p and proceed according to Algorithm C using the analogous input while $x_{up} = x_{up}^*$ and $y_{upvq} = y_{upvq}^*$. By Lemma C3, we have

$$\Pr[(u, p) \in M_L \text{ and } (v, q) \in M'_{\text{star}} | u \in G_L, p \in H_L, v \in G_R, q \in \mathcal{S}_R^p] \geq \frac{y_{upvq}^*}{4},$$

and thus, by using Lemma B3 on the fact that the event “ $(u, p) \in M_L$ and $(v, q) \in M'_{\text{star}}$ when $p = l(q)$ ” occurs only if $u \in G_L, p \in H_L, v \in G_R, q \in H_R$, we obtain

$$\Pr[(u, p) \in M_L \text{ and } (v, q) \in M'_{\text{star}} | p = l(q)] \geq \frac{y_{upvq}^*}{4} \cdot \frac{1}{32} = \frac{y_{upvq}^*}{128}.$$

From the way that the function l is defined, we can conclude that $\Pr[(u, p) \in M_L \text{ and } (v, q) \in M'_{\text{star}}] = y_{upvq}^*/128$ if $p = l(q)$, and $\Pr[(u, p) \in M_L \text{ and } (v, q) \in M'_{\text{star}}] = 0$ otherwise. Recall that by this construction, M_L is compatible. On the other hand, by the constraints of the linear programming, we have $y_{upvq}^* = 0$ if $q \notin \mathcal{L}(v)$. Thus, for each $p \in H_L$, $v \in G_R$ and $q \notin \mathcal{L}(v) \cap \mathcal{S}_R^p$, we have $\sum_{M \in \mathcal{M}_p} \alpha_M \delta_{vq}^M = z_{vq}^p = 0$. Hence, for any matching M between G_R and \mathcal{S}_R^p that contains $(v, q) \notin E_{GH}$, α_M must be 0. This implies that the matching M'_{star} is compatible. Therefore, we can consider the probability of each $(v, q) \in V_G \times V_H$ as the probability given above. We then have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mathbb{E}[Obj'(M_L, M_R)] \\
 & \geq \mathbb{E}[Obj'(M_L, M'_{\text{star}})] \\
 & = \sum_{u,v \in V_G} \sum_{p,q \in V_H} \Pr[(u,p) \in M_L \text{ and } (v,q) \in M'_{\text{star}}] w_G(u,v) w_H(p,q) \\
 & = \sum_{q \in V_H: p=l(q)} \sum_{u,v \in V_G} \Pr[(u,p) \in M_L \text{ and } (v,q) \in M'_{\text{star}}] w_G(u,v) w_H(p,q) \\
 & \geq \sum_{q \in V_H: p=l(q)} \sum_{u,v \in V_G} \frac{y_{upvq}^*}{128} w_G(u,v) w_H(p,q) \\
 & = \frac{1}{128} \sum_{q \in V_H} \sum_{u,v \in V_G} y_{ul(q)vq}^* w_G(u,v) w_H(p,q) \\
 & = \frac{1}{128} \sum_{q \in V_H} \max_{p \in V_H} \sum_{u,v \in V_G} y_{upvq}^* w_G(u,v) w_H(p,q) \\
 & \geq \frac{1}{128} \sum_{q \in V_H} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{W}_q|} \sum_{p \in \mathcal{W}_q} \sum_{u,v \in V_G} y_{upvq}^* w_G(u,v) w_H(p,q) \\
 & = \frac{1}{128} \sum_{q \in V_H} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n} + k + 1} \sum_{p \in \mathcal{W}_q} \sum_{u,v \in V_G} y_{upvq}^* w_G(u,v) w_H(p,q) \\
 & = \frac{1}{128(\sqrt{n} + k + 1)} \sum_{u,v \in V_G} \sum_{\substack{q \in V_H \\ p \in \mathcal{W}_q}} y_{upvq}^* w_G(u,v) w_H(p,q) \\
 & = \frac{1}{128(\sqrt{n} + k + 1)} \cdot LP_1^*.
 \end{aligned}$$

Note that we are considering the case $k = O(\sqrt{n})$ which implies $\sqrt{n} + k + 1 = O(\sqrt{n})$. Therefore, we can conclude that $\mathbb{E}[Obj'(M_L, M_R)] \geq LP_1^*/(128(\sqrt{n} + k + 1)) = LP_1^*/O(\sqrt{n})$ as desired. \square

D Proof of Lemma 3

Lemma 3 can be demonstrated as follows:

Proof (Proof of 3). Let G_L, H_L, G_R, H_R and x_{up}^* be those obtained in Steps 1-2 of Algorithm 1, and let $M_L^{(i)}$ be the matching produced in Steps 3-5 of case i . Obtain b random matchings between G_R and H_R , denoted by $M_{\text{rand}}^{(1)}, \dots, M_{\text{rand}}^{(b)}$. Define

$${}^bM'_L := \bigcup_{i=1}^b M_L^{(i)} \quad \text{and} \quad {}^bM'_{\text{rand}} := \bigcup_{i=1}^b M_{\text{rand}}^{(i)}.$$

Lemma B2 provides us

$$\Pr[(u,p) \in M_L^{(i)} | u \in G_L, p \in H_L] \geq \frac{x_{up}^*}{2b}$$

and

$$\Pr[(v, q) \in M'_{\text{rand}}(i) | v \in G_R, q \in H_R] = \frac{1}{|G_R|} \geq \frac{2}{n}$$

for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, b$. Note that the collection of $2b$ events “ $(u, p) \in M'_L(i)$ ” and “ $(v, q) \in M'_{\text{rand}}(i)$ ” above are mutually independent. Hence, given that $u \in G_L, p \in H_L, v \in G_R$, and $q \in H_R$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr[(u, p) \in {}^bM'_L \text{ and } (v, q) \in {}^bM'_{\text{rand}}] \\ &= \Pr[(u, p) \in {}^bM'_L] \Pr[(v, q) \in {}^bM'_{\text{rand}}] \\ &= (1 - \Pr[(u, p) \notin {}^bM'_L]) (1 - \Pr[(v, q) \notin {}^bM'_{\text{rand}}]) \\ &= (1 - \prod_{i=1}^b \Pr[(u, p) \notin M'_L(i)]) (1 - \prod_{i=1}^b \Pr[(v, q) \notin M'_{\text{rand}}(i)]) \\ &\geq (1 - (1 - \frac{x_{up}^*}{2b})^b) (1 - (1 - \frac{2}{n})^b) \\ &\geq (1 - (e^{-\frac{x_{up}^*}{2b}})^b) (1 - (e^{-\frac{2}{n}})^b) \\ &= (1 - e^{-\frac{x_{up}^*}{2}}) (1 - e^{-\frac{2b}{n}}) \\ &\geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{e}\right)^2 \cdot \frac{x_{up}^*}{2} \cdot \frac{2b}{n} \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{1}{e}\right)^2 \cdot \frac{bx_{up}^*}{n}. \end{aligned}$$

The last two inequalities follow from the fact that $1 + x \leq e^x$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $1 - e^{-x} \geq (1 - 1/e)x$ for $0 \leq x \leq 1$. Hence, by Lemma B3, we then have that for any $u, v \in V_G$ and $p, q \in V_H$,

$$\Pr[(u, v) \in {}^bM'_L \text{ and } (v, q) \in {}^bM'_{\text{rand}}] \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{e}\right)^2 \cdot \frac{bx_{up}^*}{n} \cdot \frac{1}{32} = \frac{bx_{up}^*}{c_1 n}.$$

where $c_1 = 32/(1 - 1/e)^2$. By the way of choosing bM_R in Algorithm 2, for a corresponding ${}^bM'_L$ and bM_L , we know that $\text{Obj}'({}^bM_L, {}^bM_R) \geq \text{Obj}'({}^bM'_L, {}^bM'_{\text{rand}})$. Thus, $\mathbb{E}[\text{Obj}'({}^bM_L, {}^bM_R)] \geq \mathbb{E}[\text{Obj}'({}^bM'_L, {}^bM'_{\text{rand}})]$. Furthermore, by a similar argument to which used for Lemma 1 together with the fact that $|\mathcal{U}_p| \geq \sqrt{n}/\sqrt{b}$ and $\sum_{q \in V_H} y_{upvq} \leq bx_{up}$ for all $u, v \in V_G$ and $p \in V_H$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\text{Obj}'({}^bM'_L, {}^bM'_{\text{rand}})] &\geq \frac{b}{c_1 n} \cdot \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{b}} \cdot \frac{1}{b} \sum_{u, v \in V_G} \sum_{\substack{p \in V_H \\ q \in V_H \setminus \mathcal{U}_p}} w_G(u, v) w_H(p, q) y_{upvq}^* \\ &= \frac{1}{c_1 \sqrt{bn}} \sum_{u, v \in V_G} \sum_{\substack{p \in V_H \\ q \in V_H \setminus \mathcal{U}_p}} w_G(u, v) w_H(p, q) y_{upvq}^* \end{aligned}$$

This implies $\mathbb{E}[\text{Obj}'({}^bM_L, {}^bM_R)] \geq (LP_2^*/(c_1 \sqrt{bn})) = LP_2^*/O(\sqrt{bn})$. \square

E Proof of Lemma 4

Lemma 4 can be demonstrated as follows:

Proof (Proof of Lemma 4). Recall the function l defined in the previous section. Given G_L, H_L, G_R, H_R , and the solutions x_{up}^* and y_{upvq}^* from Steps 1-2 of Algorithm 2, define for each $p \in V_H$

$$\mathcal{S}_R^p := l^{-1}(p) \cap H_R.$$

Proceed to execute Algorithm C for b iterations on the corresponding sets, using

$$x_{up} := \frac{x_{up}^*}{b} \quad \text{and} \quad y_{upvq} := \frac{y_{upvq}^*}{b^2}$$

for the relevant nodes. By the constraints of Relaxed LP2, these scaled values x_{up} and y_{upvq} satisfy the feasibility requirements of Algorithm C. Let $M_L^{(i)}$ and $M_{\text{star}}^{(i)}$ be the matchings produced in the i -th iteration, and define

$${}^bM'_L := \bigcup_{i=1}^b M_L^{(i)} \quad \text{and} \quad {}^bM'_{\text{star}} := \bigcup_{i=1}^b M_{\text{star}}^{(i)}.$$

Following Lemma C3, we have

$$\Pr[(u, p) \in M_L^{(i)} \text{ and } (v, q) \in M_{\text{star}}^{(i)} | u \in G_L, p \in H_L, v \in G_R, q \in \mathcal{S}_R^p] \geq \frac{y_{upvq}^*}{4b^2}$$

for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, b$. Since each iteration is independent from each other, the collection of the events “ $(u, p) \in M_L^{(i)}$ and $(v, q) \in M_{\text{star}}^{(i)}$ ” is mutually independent. Thus, given that $u \in G_L, p \in H_L, v \in G_R$, and $q \in \mathcal{S}_R^p$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr[(u, p) \in {}^bM'_L \text{ and } (v, q) \in {}^bM'_{\text{star}}] \\ & \geq \Pr[(u, p) \in M_L^{(1)} \text{ and } (v, q) \in M_{\text{star}}^{(1)} \text{ or} \\ & \quad \dots \text{ or } (u, p) \in M_L^{(b)} \text{ and } (v, q) \in M_{\text{star}}^{(b)}] \\ & = 1 - \Pr[(u, p) \notin M_L^{(1)} \text{ or } (v, q) \notin M_{\text{star}}^{(1)} \text{ and} \\ & \quad \dots \text{ and } (u, p) \notin M_L^{(b)} \text{ or } (v, q) \notin M_{\text{star}}^{(b)}] \\ & = 1 - \prod_{i=1}^b \Pr[(u, p) \notin M_L^{(i)} \text{ or } (v, q) \notin M_{\text{star}}^{(i)}] \\ & \geq 1 - (1 - \frac{y_{upvq}^*}{4b^2})^b \\ & \geq 1 - (e^{-\frac{y_{upvq}^*}{4b^2}})^b \\ & = 1 - e^{-\frac{y_{upvq}^*}{4b}} \\ & \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{e}\right) \cdot \frac{y_{upvq}^*}{4b}. \end{aligned}$$

Then by Lemma B3, for any $u, v \in V_G$ and $p, q \in V_H$,

$$\Pr[(u, p) \in {}^bM'_L \text{ and } (v, q) \in {}^bM'_{\text{star}} \mid p = l(q)] \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{e}\right) \cdot \frac{y_{upvq}^*}{4b} \cdot \frac{1}{32} = \frac{y_{upvq}^*}{c_2 b},$$

where $c_2 := 128/(1 - 1/e)$. Moreover,

$$\Pr[(u, p) \in {}^bM'_L \text{ and } (v, q) \in {}^bM'_{\text{star}} \mid p \neq l(q)] = 0,$$

by the construction of l . Using the same reasoning as in the proof of Lemma 3, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{Obj}'({}^bM_L, {}^bM_R)] \geq \mathbb{E}[\text{Obj}'({}^bM'_L, {}^bM'_{\text{rand}})]$$

Following the same way of proof provided for Lemma 2 along with the fact that $1/|\mathcal{U}_q| \geq \sqrt{b}/(2\sqrt{n})$, we also have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\text{Obj}'({}^bM'_L, {}^bM'_{\text{rand}})] &\geq \frac{1}{c_2 b} \cdot \frac{\sqrt{b}}{2\sqrt{n}} \sum_{u,v \in V_G} \sum_{\substack{q \in V_H \\ p \in \mathcal{U}_q}} y_{upvq}^* w_G(u, v) w_H(p, q) \\ &= \frac{1}{O(\sqrt{bn})} \sum_{u,v \in V_G} \sum_{\substack{q \in V_H \\ p \in \mathcal{U}_q}} y_{upvq}^* w_G(u, v) w_H(p, q) \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we obtain $\mathbb{E}[\text{Obj}'({}^bM_L, {}^bM_R)] \geq LP_1^*/O(\sqrt{bn})$ as desired. \square