

Part 1: Report

(a) location optimal pseudocode:

Initially all locations $m \in M$ and employees $n \in N$ are free
 while $\exists m$ that is has a free slot

do choose such a location m

let n be the highest ranked employee in m 's preference list
 whom has not been hired by m

if n is free

then (m, n) become paired

else n is currently working at m'

if n prefers m to m'

(m, n) become paired

m' is unpaired with n

return the set S of employed pairs

(b) complexity is $O(mn)$. In the worst case, the outer loop will iterate m times, and the inner loop will iterate $n-1$ times for each m (if every location is rejected by every employee until finally matched). This gives a total number of iterations of $m \cdot (n-1)$, and this gives a $O(mn)$.

(c) Initially all employees $n \in N$ and locations $m \in M$ are free.
 while $\exists n$ that is free and hasn't interviewed with every location $m \in M$
 do choose such an employee n

let m be the highest ranked location in n 's preference list

if m has open slots

then (n, m) become paired.

else m is currently employing a set, $\{n_1, \dots, n_{\text{slots}}\}$

for all employees $n_1, n_2, \dots, n_{\text{slots}}$

if m prefers n to n_i

(n, m) become paired

(m) is unpaired with n_i

return the set S of employed pairs

(d) complexity is $O(mns)$, where s is the number of jobs available at m . The difficulty arises because the job locations can accept multiple employees, which adds a dimension to its list of matchings. This list must be traversed to avoid instabilities.