

Data Envelopment Analysis models with imperfect knowledge of input and output values: An application to Portuguese public hospitals

D.C. FERREIRA^{a,*}, J.R. FIGUEIRA^b, S. GRECO^{c,d}, R.C. MARQUES^a

^a*CERIS, Instituto Superior Técnico, Universidade de Lisboa, Lisbon, Portugal*

^b*CEG-IST, Instituto Superior Técnico, Universidade de Lisboa, Lisbon, Portugal*

^c*Department of Economics and Business, University of Catania, Catania, Italy*

^d*Portsmouth Business School, Operations & Systems Management
University of Portsmouth, Portsmouth, United Kingdom*

Abstract

Assessing the technical efficiency of a set of observations requires that the associated data composed of inputs and outputs are perfectly known. If this is not the case, then biased estimates will likely be obtained. Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA) is one of the most extensively used mathematical models to estimate efficiency. It constructs a piecewise linear frontier against which all observations are compared. Since the frontier is empirically defined, any deviation resulting from low data quality (imperfect knowledge of data or IKD) may lead to efficiency under/overestimation. In this study, we model IKD and, then, apply the so-called Hit & Run procedure to randomly generate admissible observations, following some prespecified probability density functions. Sets used to model IKD limit the domain of data associated with each observation. Any point belonging to that domain is a candidate to figure out as the observation for efficiency assessment. Hence, this sampling procedure must run a sizable number of times (infinite, in theory) in such a way that it populates the whole sets. The DEA technique is used during the execution of each iteration to estimate bootstrapped efficiency scores for each observation. We use some scenarios to show that the proposed routine can outperform some of the available alternatives. We also explain how efficiency estimations can be used for statistical inference. An empirical case study based on the Portuguese public hospitals database (2013-2016) was addressed using the proposed method.

Keywords: Data Envelopment Analysis; Imperfect knowledge of data; Robustness concerns; Stochastic multicriteria acceptability analysis

*Corresponding author. Address: CERIS, Instituto Superior Técnico, Universidade de Lisboa, Lisbon, Portugal, Avenida Rovisco Pais, 1, 1049-001, Lisboa, Portugal, Phone: +351 218 418 394, Fax: +351 218 497 650

Email addresses: diogo.cunha.ferreira@tecnico.ulisboa.pt (D.C. FERREIRA), figueira@tecnico.ulisboa.pt (J.R. FIGUEIRA), salgreco@unict.it, Salvatore.Greco@port.ac.uk (S. GRECO), rui.marques@tecnico.ulisboa.pt (R.C. MARQUES)

1. Introduction

Assessing the efficiency of a set of observations, from now on called Decision Making Units (DMUs), is an economic concern of any field. Usually, we are interested in assessing whether companies, either public or private, can reduce the resources wasted (keeping the delivered services or produced goods), raise their production levels (consumed resources held), or both. For instance, several authors have identified considerable inefficiency in public health care provision translating into many resources that could be saved if providers would be efficient (Ferreira and Marques, 2015; Ferreira et al., 2018). This problem exacerbates in times of pandemic outbreaks that increase the demand for such services (Ramanathan et al., 2020).

Unfortunately, measuring each DMU's accurate level of efficiency is impossible unless we know perfectly the function describing the production/consumption profile of each group of homogeneous DMUs. Since it is often unavailable in the real world, we can only guess (estimate) the efficiency using the practical information of the group of DMUs. Traditionally, it results from using a frontier against which the DMUs are compared. The efficiency of a DMU is, roughly speaking, the relationship between its input-output observed values and targets *fixed* by the frontier. The problem, then, lies in the construction of the frontier, which can be based on a predefined parametric function or empirical data Daraio and Simar (2007). Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA) (Charnes et al., 1979; Banker, 1984) is one of the most widely employed models to estimate efficiency, especially in the public sector including health care (Hollingsworth and Peacock, 2008; Ferrera et al., 2013; Ferreira et al., 2017). DEA is a non-parametric technique as it is only empirically-based. DEA's fundamental strength is that it works based on data only, without making any assumption on the relationships mentioned above. The estimated frontier is composed of the efficient DMUs and all possible linear convex combinations of them (Cordero et al., 2016). Thus, the efficient frontier is a continuum of input-output vectors. Targets for inefficient DMUs result from the linear combination of observations associated with the efficient ones.

Nonetheless, empirical research in social sciences is often plagued by the imperfect knowledge of data (IKD), resulting from: uncertainty, imprecision, ill-determinations, arbitrariness, and missing data (Hayek, 1945; French, 1995; Roy et al., 2014). IKD can be either epistemic or aleatory, resulting from limited knowledge or randomness/variability in data, respectively. Meanwhile, these imperfect knowledge sources can be due to human errors, experimental failures, and disclosure restrictions, to name just a few. Models used to estimate efficiency, including DEA, are typically sensitive to data quality (Witte and Marques, 2010). Hence, IKD is a serious problem to get reliable or robust efficiency estimates for the DMUs. A DMU is *robust efficient* whenever it remains efficient for all the input-output observations, regardless of the data quality. It is *sufficiently robust*

efficient when it is not efficient for all the input-output observations but it can be part of the frontier in a given number of times (threshold).

Several approaches have been proposed in the literature to account for and dealing with the problem of IKD. The way of modeling such imperfect knowledge includes, for instance, the omission of data, their substitution, and the use of feasible possible sets of values. The approaches comprise DEA standard techniques, stochastic programming, fuzzy-possibilistic programming, interval programming, and robust optimization (Despotis and Smirlis, 2002; Kao and Liu, 2007; Kuosmanen, 2009; Ehrgott et al., 2018). Although the alternatives mentioned above have their merits, they also exhibit some disadvantages and caveats. On the one hand, some alternatives are difficult to implement, requiring a considerable computational effort (since they are of exact algorithmic nature). On the other hand, others sometimes impose objectionable substitutions of imperfectly known data or disregard the modeling of IKD, allowing neither the analysis of efficiency distributions nor statistical inference. For instance, some do not allow us to classify a DMU as robust or sufficiently robust efficient, or as perfectly robust efficient, potentially robust efficient and robust inefficient units as in Wei and Wang (2017).

This paper proposes an alternative based on the so-called Hit & Run (HR) procedure (Smith, 1984; Bélisle et al., 1993; Kaufman and Smith, 1998), which avoids the previous shortcomings. This alternative lies in defining of a set (and its boundary) in the space containing all admissible points that can model the IKD associated with a given DMU. By doing this for all DMUs, we can achieve a large number of efficiency estimates per DMU, allowing us to conduct statistical inference with them. The HR procedure is commonly associated with the Stochastic Multicriteria Acceptability Analysis (SMAA), which, in turn, is associated with multiple criteria decision analysis rather than efficiency assessment; see Yang et al. (2012), for instance. Lahdelma and Salminen (2006), and Kadziński et al. (2017) combined the SMAA model with DEA, exploring the space of multipliers optimized by the primal DEA. This integration allows describing DMUs in terms of rank acceptability indices, central weights, and confidence factors, which can be useful because the DEA technique does not discern efficient DMUs among them. As quoted by Lahdelma and Salminen (2006), “*these so-called non-parametric methods [DEA and SMAA] explore the weight space in order to identify weights favorable for each alternative [DMU].*”

In this study:

1. We propose an alternative that lies in defining a set (and its boundary) in the space containing all admissible points that can model the IKD of a given DMU. We can apply our model regardless of the epistemic or aleatory nature of the imperfect knowledge – all rely on the appropriate definition of the set. We can achieve a large number of efficiency estimates per DMU, after running our algorithm a sufficient

number of times, and making a statistical inference with each iteration results. Differently from [Lahdelma and Salminen \(2006\)](#), [Yang et al. \(2012\)](#), and [Kadziński et al. \(2017\)](#), who applied SMAA to the multipliers optimized by DEA, we introduce stochastic nature directly on input-output data through the definition of sets representing the imperfect knowledge of such data.

2. We propose to bound imperfectly known data into convex sets (although non-convexity is allowed for those sets, they do not seem natural choices and, besides, they require the adoption of rejection strategies of some generated points). Creating data bounds is usually preferable to the analyst/expert because they are intuitive in many applications. For instance, let us suppose that a given hospital report sets the number of treated inpatients as twelve thousand. It is hardly the truly measured number of inpatients seen in that hospital ward and, as it is well known, DEA is quite sensitive to data quality ([Cabrera et al., 2018](#)). It means that, because of rounding, the actual number of inpatients lies within 11,500 and 12,499. These values might, then, be set as bounds for the imperfectly known datum. Modeling IKD through different set shapes, including hyper-boxes and hyper-ellipsoids, is also an exciting and useful exercise. We provide the parametric equations that rule the IKD modeling, considering that the extremes of those shapes are the data sets built with the experts' help.
3. We compare our proposed approach with some alternatives that, due to their simplicity, are traditionally employed to replace IKD (including missing data). One is the interesting interval DEA ([Despotis and Smirlis, 2002](#); [Smirlis et al., 2006](#)). It will be easy to conclude that it is a particular case of our approach.
4. We also explain how to perform statistical inference using the estimates of efficiency.
5. Finally, we employ our proposed approach to study public hospitals' performance considering a set of inputs, and desirable and undesirable outputs. The case study was based on the Portuguese public hospitals using data from 2013 to 2016, considering production-related inputs-outputs and some outputs related to quality and access. Disregarding this kind of variable when assessing hospital performance is likely to result in a financial analysis not accounting for the social functions of the public hospitals ([Ferreira and Marques, 2018](#)).

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. Section 2 presents some notation and briefly describes a DEA model based on the distance from the observations to the empirical frontier. Section 3 makes a review of the different ways used to deal with imperfect knowledge in DEA. Section 4 shows the basics of the HR

routine and some ways of modeling data imperfect knowledge. Section 5 explains how the HR routine can be integrated with DEA for robust efficiency estimates assessment, compares the proposed method with other alternatives, explains how we can make statistical inference using the efficiency estimates, and makes some additional considerations regarding the integrated approach's robustness. Section 6 uses a dataset composed of 108 Portuguese public hospitals and an appropriate DEA in the presence of undesirable outputs to test the proposed method. Finally, Section 7 concludes this paper.

2. Data Envelopment Analysis

This section introduces the basic notation, the DEA model, and some of its variants.

2.1. Basic notation and some definitions

This subsection comprises five paragraphs successively devoted to the problem definition, the raw data of a model, and the concept of efficiency followed by the efficient frontier. Finally, the cases of inefficient DMUs and directional improvements are introduced.

Problem definition. DEA is a model to assess the *technical efficiency* of observations called, in this context, DMUs, through an *input-output* transformation analysis (Cooper et al., 2007). *Inputs* represent the resources consumed to produce some goods or to deliver some services, generically called *outputs*. An *observation* in the literature also designates a pair formed by both inputs and outputs.

Basic data. Consider $DMU_1, \dots, DMU_j, \dots, DMU_n$ the set of DMUs to be analyzed (J will be used to denote the set of the DMUs' indices). Let $x^j = (x_1^j, \dots, x_i^j, \dots, x_m^j)^\top$ denote a vector, where the m components are the inputs used by the unit j , for $j = 1, \dots, n$. Similarly, we define X as the $m \times n$ input matrix, for all the DMUs considered. We can also define $y^j = (y_1^j, \dots, y_r^j, \dots, y_s^j)^\top$ as the vector, where the s components are the outputs produced by the unit j , for $j = 1, \dots, n$. Y denotes the $s \times n$ output matrix, for all the DMUs analyzed.

Efficient DMUs. In the classical model with constant returns to scale, the (technical) efficiency of a unit $k \in J$ is, roughly speaking, the relationship (ratio) between the weighted sum of the outputs and the weighted sum of the inputs. These (input and output) weights (also called the input and output *multipliers*) are, in general, assessed through the resolution of a linear programming model. It allows to compare DMU k with all the DMUs $j \in J$ (including DMU k itself). The process should be done for all DMUs $j \in J$. DEA optimizes those multipliers (subject to certain constraints) trying to maximize the efficiency of DMU k regarding the entire set

J . More formally, there are two ways of defining efficiency. A DMU k is technically efficient concerning J if for its levels of consumed inputs, x^k , no other DMU produces more (desirable) outputs than y^k . Likewise, for its produced/delivered outputs, y^k , no other DMU consumes fewer inputs than x^k .

Efficient frontier. For all technically efficient DMUs $k \in J$, the vectors y^k and x^k as well as all the linear convex combinations of such vectors allow the construction of the efficient frontier F , where the coefficients, $\mu_1^k, \dots, \mu_j^k, \dots, \mu_n^k$, are non-negative and must fulfill the normalization condition $\sum_{j=1}^n \mu_j^k = 1$.

Inefficient DMUs and directional improvements. Inefficient DMUs do not belong to the frontier F . To improve their efficiency, they must be projected on F . Let D^k denote the distance between the vectors x^k and y^k , on the one hand, and the frontier F , on the other hand, following a path defined by two direction vectors, δ^x and δ^y (a directional vector δ can be formed from these two vectors). It is obvious that when k belongs to F , it is technically efficient and $D^k = 0$. Otherwise, it is inefficient and $D^k > 0$. Classical models of DEA usually assume either an input- or an output-orientation. There are three situations. In the case of input-oriented models, $\delta = (x^k, 0)$, *i.e.*, inputs might be reduced by a factor $(1 - D^k) \in]0, 1]$, keeping the same levels of outputs, to turn k more efficient. In the case of output-oriented models, $\delta = (0, y^k)$ and outputs can be increased by a factor $1/(1 + D^k) \geq 1$, inputs held. In a more generic case, we may define a vector δ with nonzero components. The resulting model is said to be *directional*, as it allows the simultaneous inputs' contraction and outputs' expansion.

Once projected on F , the DMU k becomes featured by the so-called *targets*, which are the corresponding optimal values for the inputs and outputs of k . In other words, targets characterize F from the linear convex combinations of the observations associated with efficient DMUs. These targets are denoted by x^{*j} and y^{*j} , for $j \in J$. Targets depend essentially on the distance D^j and on the improvement direction δ . Efficient DMUs $j \in J$ verify $x^{*j} = x^j$ and $y^{*j} = y^j$, because $D^j = 0$, regardless of δ . However, if $k \in J$ is not efficient, F outperforms k and the following holds: $\exists_{i=1, \dots, m} x_i^{*k} < x_i^k$ or $\exists_{r=1, \dots, s} y_r^{*k} > y_r^k$. These inequalities can be transformed into equations using *slacks*. There is a non-negative slack for each variable. Assuming that these slacks result from the product between the scalar D^k (distance to the frontier) and the components of the directional vector, as well as a quantity that does not depend on these two factors, we have: $x^{*k} = x^k - D^k \delta^x - \gamma^x$ and $y^{*k} = y^k + D^k \delta^y + \gamma^y$.

2.2. A radial directional DEA model

The most popular version of a DEA model assumes that the targets correspond to the weighted arithmetic mean of all observations: $x_i^{*k} = \sum_{j=1}^n \mu_j^k x_i^j$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, and $y_r^{*k} = \sum_{j=1}^n \mu_j^k y_r^j$, $r = 1, \dots, s$, such that $\sum_{j=1}^n \mu_j^k = 1$. Therefore, optimizing targets means optimizing the weights μ^k . Because of the inequalities ruling the relationship between targets and observations, we have: $\sum_{j=1}^n \mu_j^k x_i^j \leq x_i^k$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, and $\sum_{j=1}^n \mu_j^k y_r^j \geq y_r^k$, $r = 1, \dots, s$. Assuming that both inputs and outputs are allowed to change radially to project (x^k, y^k) on F , and also that such a change depends on a predefined path, $\delta = (\delta^x, \delta^y)$, the radial distance from k to F is a non-negative scalar ($D^k \in \mathbb{Z}$). It means that the previous inequalities can be rewritten as follows: $\sum_{j=1}^n \mu_j^k x_i^j \leq x_i^k - D^k \delta_i^x$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, and $\sum_{j=1}^n \mu_j^k y_r^j \geq y_r^k + D^k \delta_r^y$, $r = 1, \dots, s$. Since we want to know what is the largest value of D^k and possible slacks that keep feasible the previous systems of constraints, a linear problem can be stated as follows, *vide* Equation (2.1) (Fukuyama and Weber, 2017).

$$\begin{aligned}
 D^{*k} = \max \quad & D^k + \varepsilon \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \gamma_i^x + \sum_{r=1}^s \gamma_r^y \right) \\
 \text{subject to:} \quad & \\
 & \sum_{j=1}^n \mu_j^k x_i^j + D^k \delta_i^x + \gamma_i^x = x_i^k, \quad i = 1, \dots, m, \\
 & \sum_{j=1}^n \mu_j^k y_r^j - D^k \delta_r^y - \gamma_r^y = y_r^k, \quad r = 1, \dots, s, \\
 & \sum_{j=1}^n \mu_j^k = 1, \\
 & \mu_j^k \geq 0, \quad j = 1, \dots, n, \\
 & \gamma_i^x \geq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, m, \\
 & \gamma_r^y \geq 0, \quad r = 1, \dots, s.
 \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

2.3. Data Envelopment Analysis with undesirable outputs

Hitherto, the DEA model 2.1 has considered inputs and desirable outputs. However, some undesirable outputs are usually produced (in some cases, desirable outputs cannot be produced/delivered without the undesirable ones). Let $u^j = (u_1^j, \dots, u_h^j, \dots, u_v^j)^\top$ be a vector associated with the p components representing the undesirable output levels produced by the DMU j . As before, U denotes the $p \times n$ undesirable output matrix, for all the DMUs considered. In this case, targets associated with undesirable outputs are: $u_h^{*k} = \sum_{j=1}^n \mu_j^k u_h^j$, $h = 1, \dots, v$. It is straightforward to conclude that $u_h^{*k} \leq u_h^k$, for all $h \in \{1, \dots, v\}$. Given the commonly assumed weak

disposability over undesirable outputs, the previous relationship can be rewritten in terms of the distance D^k and the components δ^u for the directional vector, $\delta = (\delta^x, \delta^y, \delta^u)$:

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \mu_j^k u_h^j + D^k \delta_h^u = u_h^k, \quad h = 1, \dots, v. \quad (2.2)$$

Equation (2.2) can be inserted into Model (2.1) as a new constraint. Unfortunately, it does not correctly deal with undesirable outputs (Kuosmanen, 2005; Kuosmanen and Podinovski, 2009). The imposition of an equation related to the weak disposability in undesirable outputs is not sufficient. An abatement factor $\theta_j^k \in [0, 1]$ should be applied to the intensities μ_j^k in the outputs-related constraints. It results into a nonlinear problem that demands for linearization. Let the intensities μ_j^k be partitioned into two non-negative factors, α_j^k and β_j^k , *i.e.*, $\mu_j^k = \alpha_j^k + \beta_j^k$ for $\alpha_j^k, \beta_j^k \geq 0$ for all $j \in J$. If $\alpha_j^k = \theta_j^k \mu_j^k$ represents the part of DMU k remaining active, then $\beta_j^k = (1 - \theta_j^k) \mu_j^k$ is the part of that DMU's output abated via scaling down of activity level (Kuosmanen, 2005). In light of this, we get the following model:

$$\begin{aligned} D^{*k} = \max \quad & D^k + \varepsilon \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \gamma_i^x + \sum_{r=1}^s \gamma_r^y \right) \\ \text{subject to:} \quad & \\ & \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j^k x_i^j + \sum_{j=1}^n \beta_j^k x_i^j + D^k \delta_i^x + \gamma_i^x = x_i^k, \quad i = 1, \dots, m, \\ & \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j^k y_r^j - D^k \delta_r^y - \gamma_r^y = y_r^k, \quad r = 1, \dots, s, \\ & \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j^k u_h^j + D^k \delta_h^u = u_h^k, \quad h = 1, \dots, p, \\ & \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j^k + \sum_{j=1}^n \beta_j^k = 1, \\ & \alpha_j^k, \beta_j^k \geq 0, \quad j = 1, \dots, n, \\ & \gamma_i^x \geq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, m, \\ & \gamma_r^y \geq 0, \quad r = 1, \dots, s. \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

We use Model (2.3) to estimate the Portuguese public hospitals' efficiency levels in our case study (*vide infra*).

3. Dealing with imperfect knowledge in DEA: A brief review

DEA and other models alike, require in general that all inputs and outputs are perfectly known. If this is not the case, then biased conclusions may arise because models are typically sensitive to data quality. The biasing degree may naturally depend on the extent of the IKD. Several alternatives have been proposed in the literature, each with its advantages, shortcomings, and caveats.

It is essential to understand the problem of IKD for efficiency assessment. There are several ways of modeling the IKD. They can be classified into four distinct groups: (1) deletion of observations, (2) simple or pure substitution of observations, (3) more sophisticated substitutions, and (4) feasible sets of values.

1. *Modeling through the deletion of DMUs with imperfect data (Omission)*. Perhaps, deletion of DMUs is the most employed way of modeling IKD, especially in exploratory analyses involving statistical tests or when the sample's size is substantial. However, we note that disregarding DMUs from the efficiency analysis could be a pitfall, as they can be potential benchmarks. It decreases the statistical power of the conducted analyses. Despite these disadvantages, the deletion of DMUs featured by IKD is easy to implement and justified, making it so largely employed. Two main approaches to deal with omission are:

- a) *Listwise (complete case) deletion*. In this case, we check for IKD cases and remove the associated DMUs from the analysis. The remaining sample is, then, used for the efficiency assessment through the traditional linear programming techniques. Listwise deletion may decrease the statistical power of the employed method, in any case.
- b) *Pairwise deletion*. Unlike the previous case, pairwise deletion corresponds to the removal of a DMU when its data is imperfectly known for a given variable and only if this one is under analysis. The same DMU is, then, carried back into the analysis if that variable is no longer considered. This kind of approach makes DEA-based models incomparable if they were based on the same dataset.

2. *Modeling through simple substitution of imperfectly known data (Imputation)*. In this group, IKD are replaced by *appropriate* estimates. Since these estimates could not be the most appropriate ones, the procedure should be repeated a considerable number of times. Some approaches for dealing with imputation are:

- a) *Hot-deck imputation* (Reilly, 1993). This technique is based on the idea that similar DMUs exhibit identical consumption and production profiles. Hence, we replace imperfectly known data with values

- copied from (randomly selected) similar observations.
- b) *Cold-deck imputation*. As in the case of hot-deck imputation, in this case, one substitutes IKD using similar observation but that belongs to another dataset.
 - c) *Mean imputation (or mean substitution)* (Raaijmakers, 1999). IKD are replaced with the average of the considered variable. It does not change the mean of that variable. However, it carries out some problems due to the attenuation of correlations involving the imputed variable(s), thus being problematic in multivariate analyses.
 - d) *Regression* (Olinsky et al., 2003). We can use a simple or multiple regression model with non-imperfect data to replace values featured by imperfect knowledge. Random noise can also be added to the estimate. Each fitted value is associated with a confidence interval translating the error of the estimate. The estimation is as good as any other value within that interval to substitute imperfect data. Moreover, the *optimal/ideal* model is often challenging to achieve.
 - e) *Multiple imputation*. Each entry of IKD is substituted many times using appropriate distributions, and generating as much different outcomes and analyses.
3. *Modeling through more sophisticated substitution (Analysis)*. This kind of method mainly uses the maximum likelihood estimation to assess some relevant parameters to the analysis.
- a) *Expectation-maximization (Dempster-Laird-Rubin) algorithm*. This algorithm starts by determining the model parameters and by estimating potential alternative values for IKD given current observations. Parameters are, then, refined admitting that IKD are perfectly known. Using these parameters, one re-estimates the substitutes for IKD. The process repeats until convergence is achieved.
 - b) *Maximum likelihood estimation*. Differently from the previous method, in this case one only determines the model parameters once and, if necessary, estimate then the acceptable substitutes for the cases of IKD.
4. *Modeling through feasible sets of values*. When imperfect knowledge cannot be modeled by using a single point (as it is quite restrictive and, unfortunately, frequent), a pleasing way is to consider sets of feasible points. For continuous intervals, there are two main approaches:
- a) *Interval DEA* (Despotis and Smirlis, 2002; Smirlis et al., 2006). This procedure establishes boundaries for data imperfect knowledge: $x^j \in [\underline{x}^j, \bar{x}^j]$ and $y^j \in [\underline{y}^j, \bar{y}^j]$ for $j \in J$. Of course, if data are perfectly

known, then $\exists j \in J$ such that $\underline{x}^j = \bar{x}^j$ and $\underline{y}^j = \bar{y}^j$. Notwithstanding, one defines two scenarios: (W) worst, described by $\mathcal{S}^W = \{(x^j, y^j) \in \mathbb{R}_+^m \times \mathbb{R}_+^s \mid x^j = \bar{x}^j, y^j = \underline{y}^j, j \in J\}$, and (B) best, with $\mathcal{S}^B = \{(x^j, y^j) \in \mathbb{R}_+^m \times \mathbb{R}_+^s \mid x^j = \underline{x}^j, y^j = \bar{y}^j, j \in J\}$. One, then, may apply Model (2.1) to project the worst version of DMU k , $(\bar{x}^k, \underline{y}^k)$, into the frontier constructed using \mathcal{S}^B , to achieve the maximum distance of k to the frontier under imperfect knowledge: \bar{D}^{*k} . Likewise, one may project the best version of k , $(\underline{x}^k, \bar{y}^k)$, into the frontier constructed with \mathcal{S}^W , and get the smallest distance of k to the frontier: \underline{D}^{*k} . Therefore, one concludes that there is an interval associated with the efficiency of DMU k : $D^{*k} \in [\underline{D}^{*k}, \bar{D}^{*k}]$. Although useful to fix boundaries for the efficiency of DMUs, this alternative disregards the modeling of IKD, making both the analysis of efficiency distributions and the application of statistical tests impossible.

- b) *Fuzzy set DEA* (Soleimani-damaneh et al., 2006; Kao and Liu, 2007; Wu, 2009; Emrouznejad and Tavana, 2014; Lio and Liu, 2018). One applies the fuzzy set theory to DEA. In general, it is not possible to solve fuzzy DEA models using linear programming solvers because the coefficients of such models are fuzzy sets. Estimating efficiency scores through this approach is usually difficult because *"a large number of input variables in fuzzy logic could result in a significant number of rules that are needed to specify a dynamic model"* (Shokouhi et al., 2010). Entani et al. (2002) used the interval DEA together with the fuzzy approach to rank DMUs.

Omission and imputation are the most relevant and frequent ways of handling IKD regarding the DEA utilization for efficiency assessment. Whereas the omission of DMUs from the dataset is an easy exercise, there are several alternatives to attribute (estimate) values when data is imperfectly known. The simple act of deleting DMUs from the analysis is often sufficient to bias the results. As it is widely known, DEA is prone to the so-called *curse of dimensionality*. Thus, imputation can be seen as a better approach for efficiency assessment in the presence of IKD. The following are some of the most relevant alternatives to deal with this problem in DEA (and models alike); see Wen (2015) for more details:

- a) *Blank entries* (Kuosmanen, 2009). When one input or one output is missing from the dataset for a given DMU, it can simply be replaced by a large value (*big M*) or by zero, respectively, to mitigate the influence of DMUs with missing data on the efficiency assessment of other observations. Although formulated regarding the case of blank entries, this approach could easily be extended to the general case of IKD. However, we note that, despite its simplicity, this alternative is problematic when the number

of imperfectly known cases is large, translating into biased results (substantial inefficiency levels). The problem exacerbates when there is a certain degree of knowledge even for the cases of IKD. Moreover, efficiency estimates are not comparable among different DMUs because they are no longer evaluated using the same basis (the same variables).

- b) *DEA with Halo effect* (Zha et al., 2013). In this approach, one uses the mean imputation for the cases of IKD. Then, one estimates the efficiency scores and rank DMUs. Finally, considering DMU k (with IKD), which is in position \mathcal{P}^k , one defines the interval of admissible values for imperfectly known data using the values of DMUs in positions $\mathcal{P}^k \pm 1$. This approach resembles the hot-deck imputation. First, using the mean values to replace IKD should produce inaccurate efficiency levels and, accordingly, biased ranks. Sustaining a whole procedure on potentially biased ranks does not seem correct. Second, the values observed for the DMU positioned in rank $\mathcal{P}^k + 1$ (or $\mathcal{P}^k - 1$) do not necessarily fit the IKD of DMU k .
- c) *Uncertain DEA* (Ehrgott et al., 2018). This model determines the amount of uncertainty necessary to raise the efficiency score of a DMU featured by IKD. Unfortunately, it usually results on nonlinear models that are difficult to solve.
- d) *Imprecise DEA* (Cooper et al., 1999; Park, 2010), which also returns nonlinear models because data are imprecise. Some linearizations have been proposed in the literature, as in Zhu (2003), after scale transformation and variable alternations or procedures that turn imprecise into exact data. The interval DEA of Despotis and Smirlis (2002) is an extension of the imprecise DEA.
- e) *Robust optimization and DEA* (Shokouhi et al., 2010; Salahi et al., 2016), which is based on the concept of uncertainty sets, a robust counterpart optimization, and the imposition of a probability bound for constraints violation.
- f) *Stochastic DEA* (Sengupta, 1992). It specifies a probability density function to model errors in data. According to Olesen and Petersen (2016), there are two main directions upon which the stochastic DEA has been developed:
 - one based on statistical (but restrictive) axioms defining a statistical model and a sampling process into the DEA framework that provides biased estimators of the actual frontier (Banker, 1993); and
 - another, based on the theory of chance constraints, replaces data with DMU-specific distributions (Olesen, 2006). Olesen and Petersen (2016) pointed out that one may criticize this approach because

no formal statistical model with a sampling process is specified, making it challenging to identify what it is being estimated.

In the next section, we propose an alternative based on the so-called HR to replace IKD using few simple mathematical operations and a linear program within a for/while cycle (during some iterations). This Monte-Carlo-like operation makes the proposed alternative very easy to implement and run. It does not suffer from the problems verified for blank entries, DEA with Halo effect, fuzzy set DEA, and uncertain DEA. This alternative was inspired by the interval DEA, the robust optimization with DEA, and the stochastic DEA. We establish boundaries for IKD and draw observations within that boundary. However, our approach does not insert in any of the two directions of the stochastic DEA as identified before. Also, we do not specify any distribution function to model errors in data, which may not be realistic. Usually, there is no evidence to choose one type of distribution function. Unlike interval DEA, our proposal allows to specify IKD modeling using appropriate sets and obtain a considerable number of efficiency estimates. These, in turn, are useful for the analysis of efficiency distributions and statistical inference. Notice that all potential values belonging to those sets are admissible observations for the cases of IKD. Likewise, any points in the Euclidean space \mathbb{R}_+^{m+s+v} outside the sets are not admissible observations. Therefore, our proposal is out of the scope of the fuzzy set DEA.

4. The Hit & Run algorithm

In this section, we propose a HR routine (Smith, 1984; Bélisle et al., 1993; Kaufman and Smith, 1998) to simulate values belonging to a bounded set. This routine is a straightforward and useful procedure to simulate feasible points within a bounded (either convex or not) set, Λ .

4.1. A first illustrative example

Let us start with an example of a convex set in the Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^2 . We show the HR routine, step-by-step, based on the example of Figure 4.1.

1. Define the constraints associated with the set Λ . In this example, we consider Λ defined through the following five constraints: (1) $x_1 + x_2 \leq 10$, (2) $-5x_1 + x_2 \geq -10$, (3) $-2x_1 + x_2 \leq 5$, (4) $x_1 \geq 0$, and (5) $x_2 \geq 0$.
2. Select an initial point within $\Lambda \in \mathbb{R}^z$, $P^{(0)} = (P_1^{(0)}, \dots, P_l^{(0)}, \dots, P_z^{(0)})$. In this case, $\Lambda \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $P^{(0)} = (2, 6)$. Figure 4.1a exhibits the bounded set and the starting point for this example.

3. Randomly select a directional vector, $d^{(1)}$, with unitary Euclidean norm, say $d^{(1)} = \frac{(0.20, 0.40)}{\sqrt{0.20^2 + 0.40^2}}$.
4. Determine the distance, $\lambda^{(1)}$, between $P^{(0)}$ and the boundary of Λ .
 - (a) Define the point in the boundary as $\hat{P}^{(0)} = P^{(0)} + \lambda^{(1)}d^{(1)}$.
 - (b) Compute $\lambda_1^{(1)}$ associated with the first constraint defining Λ . The point $\hat{P}^{(0)}$ verifies $\hat{P}_1^{(0)} + \hat{P}_2^{(0)} = 10$ or, equivalently, $P_1^{(0)} + \lambda_1^{(1)}d_1^{(1)} + P_2^{(0)} + \lambda_1^{(1)}d_2^{(1)} = 10 \Leftrightarrow \lambda_1^{(1)} = \frac{10 - (P_1^{(0)} + P_2^{(0)})}{d_1^{(1)} + d_2^{(1)}}$. In this case, $\lambda_1^{(1)} = \frac{10 - (2+6)}{0.20+0.40}\sqrt{0.20^2 + 0.40^2} = \frac{10}{3}\sqrt{0.20^2 + 0.40^2}$.
 - (c) Compute $\lambda_2^{(1)}, \dots, \lambda_5^{(1)}$ associated with the other four constraints defining Λ , similarly. See Figure 4.1b. In this example, $\lambda_2^{(1)} = 10\sqrt{0.20^2 + 0.40^2}$, $\lambda_3^{(1)} = +\infty$ (because $(-2, 1)^\top d^{(1)} = 0$), $\lambda_4^{(1)} = -10\sqrt{0.20^2 + 0.40^2}$, $\lambda_5^{(1)} = -15\sqrt{0.20^2 + 0.40^2}$.
 - (d) Compute $\lambda^{(1)} = \min_{\lambda_q^{(1)} \geq 0, q=1, \dots, 5} \{\lambda_1^{(1)}, \lambda_2^{(1)}, \lambda_3^{(1)}, \lambda_4^{(1)}, \lambda_5^{(1)}\} = \frac{10}{3}\sqrt{0.20^2 + 0.40^2}$.
5. Project $P^{(0)}$ on the boundary of Λ following the direction $d^{(1)}$, and obtain the point $\hat{P}^{(0)} = (\hat{P}_1^{(0)}, \hat{P}_2^{(0)})$ in the boundary. In this example, $\hat{P}^{(0)} = (2, 6) + \frac{10}{3}\sqrt{0.20^2 + 0.40^2}(0.20, 0.40) = \frac{\sqrt{0.20^2 + 0.40^2}}{3}(8, 22)$.
6. Define the line linking $P^{(0)}$ to $\hat{P}^{(0)}$, as $L^{(1)} = \Lambda \cap \{P \in \mathbb{R}^z, e \in [0, 1] \mid P = P^{(0)} + \lambda^{(1)}d^{(1)}e\}$.
7. Define a new point $P^{(1)}$ belonging to $L^{(1)}$, as follows:
 - (a) Randomly (with replacement) generate a number $\xi \sim \text{uniform}(0, 1)$. In this example, $\xi = 0.60$.
 - (b) Compute the point $P^{(1)} = P^{(0)} + \lambda^{(1)}d^{(1)}e$, replacing e by ξ .
8. Repeat Steps 3-7 considering the previous point $P^{(1)}$ as the starting point. For example, the second iteration starts from this intermediary point, whose projection is $(\hat{P}_1^{(1)}, \hat{P}_2^{(1)}) = (16/5, 6)$ because $\lambda^{(2)} = 1.60$ and according to $d^{(2)} = \frac{(0.5, -0.5)}{\sqrt{0.5^2 + 0.5^2}}$. Choosing $\xi = 0.75$, we get $(P_1^{(2)}, P_2^{(2)}) = (3, 31/5)$. The result of a few more iterations is also shown in Figure 4.1a using red dots.

4.2. The Hit & Run algorithm for imperfect knowledge of data modeling

Algorithm 1 in Appendix A synthesizes the HR algorithm for data generation (simulation) within the set Λ .¹

¹Appendix available online at: https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1jAmKFzz_PWyPKSNTxqO_0mM8BWKWn3-D?usp=sharing




Figure 4.1: Hit & Run framework applied to a simple convex set.

4.3. General computation of distance parameters for convex sets defined by linear constraints

From the example in Subsection 4.1 and Algorithm 1 (Appendix A), the importance of computing the parameter λ related to the distance of a point to the frontier makes it clear. Of course, such a distance depends on the shape of Λ . This subsection describes the general computation of λ parameters considering convex polytopes defined by several linear constraints. From now on, we consider that these sets must be convex (Gregory et al., 2011), in line with some robust optimization developments.

Let us consider a polytope defined by the intersection of p linear constraints:

$$\sum_{l=1}^z a_{ql} x_l \leq b_q, \quad q = 1, \dots, p, \quad (4.1)$$

such that the parameters a_{ql} and b_q are real numbers. One of the first iterations of HR consists of defining a starting point $P^{(0)}$ and to project it on the boundary of Λ following a directional vector $d^{(1)}$. Note that, in the boundary of Λ , the constraints of the polytope write as $\sum_{l=1}^z a_{ql} x_l = b_q$, $q = 1, \dots, p$. That being said, it is straightforward to conclude that $\sum_{l=1}^z a_{ql} (P_l^{(0)} + \lambda_q^{(1)} d_l^{(1)}) = b_q$, $q = 1, \dots, p$, being $\lambda_q^{(1)}$ the distance between

$P^{(0)}$ and the boundary of Λ . This Equation can be rewritten as follows:

$$\lambda_q^{(1)} = \frac{b_q - \sum_{l=1}^z a_{ql} P_l^{(0)}}{\sum_{l=1}^z a_{ql} d_l^{(1)}}, \quad q = 1, \dots, p. \quad (4.2)$$

Note that there are p values for these λ parameters, and we select the smallest non-negative value among them:

$$\lambda^{(1)} = \min_{\lambda \geq 0} \{\lambda_1^{(1)}, \dots, \lambda_q^{(1)}, \dots, \lambda_p^{(1)}\} \quad (4.3)$$

The HR routine runs for a significant number of times, t . Hence, there are $p \cdot t$ distinct estimates for λ , denoted from now on by $\lambda_q^{(\ell)}$ for $q = 1, \dots, p$ and $\ell = 1, \dots, t$. The generic Equation ruling the estimation of these parameters is as follows:

$$\lambda_q^{(\ell)} = \frac{b_q - \sum_{l=1}^z a_{ql} P_l^{(\ell-1)}}{\sum_{l=1}^z a_{ql} d_l^{(\ell)}}, \quad q = 1, \dots, p, \quad \ell = 1, \dots, t. \quad (4.4)$$

The parameter $\lambda^{(\ell)}$ associated with the ℓ -th iteration of the HR algorithm is:

$$\lambda^{(\ell)} = \min_{\lambda \geq 0} \{\lambda_1^{(\ell)}, \dots, \lambda_q^{(\ell)}, \dots, \lambda_p^{(\ell)}\}, \quad \ell = 1, \dots, t. \quad (4.5)$$

The estimation of the parameter $\lambda^{(\ell)}$ naturally depends upon the shape of Λ . The next subsection presents some particular ways of modeling the IKD through the definition of Λ .

4.4. Particular cases of modeling data imperfect knowledge

There are endless ways of modeling the sets describing the IKD. The most natural one is, perhaps, assuming that it is well modeled by a box in the Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^z ([Soyster, 1973](#)). However, other alternatives are available, including hyper-ellipsoids ([Ben-Tal and Nemirovski, 1998, 2000](#)), hyper-rhombi or polyhedral ([Bertsimas and Sim, 2004](#)), or, more generic, super-ellipses ([Gielis, 2003](#)). The estimation of the parameter $\lambda^{(\ell)}$ associated with the ℓ th iteration of the HR procedure largely depends on the definition of Λ . The definition of this set's shape is not always straightforward, although some insights have been provided in the literature. For instance, [Bertsimas et al. \(2018\)](#) propose to use historical data and statistical estimates to define data-driven sets, while [Bertsimas and Brown \(2009\)](#) rely on decision-maker risk preferences based on the theory of coherent risk measures of [Artzner et al. \(1999\)](#).

4.4.1. The case of hyper-box

As said, the most simple way of modeling IKD is through a hyper-box in \mathbb{R}^z ; see Definition 4.1. Figure B.1a in Appendix B exhibits 10,000 points generated by HR for a two-dimension box with $x_1 \in [2, 8]$ and $x_2 \in [3, 7]$.

Definition 4.1 (Hyper-box in \mathbb{R}^z). The hyper-box whose set Λ is defined by

$$\Lambda = \{(x_1, \dots, x_l, \dots, x_z) \in \mathbb{R}^z \mid x_1 \in [\underline{x}_1, \bar{x}_1], \dots, x_l \in [\underline{x}_l, \bar{x}_l], \dots, x_z \in [\underline{x}_z, \bar{x}_z]\} \quad (4.6)$$

is associated with

$$\lambda^{(\ell)} = \min \left\{ \min_{\lambda \geq 0} \left\{ \frac{\underline{x}_l - P_l^{(\ell-1)}}{d_l^{(\ell)}}, l = 1, \dots, z \right\}, \min_{\lambda \geq 0} \left\{ \frac{\bar{x}_l - P_l^{(\ell-1)}}{d_l^{(\ell)}}, l = 1, \dots, z \right\} \right\}, \quad \ell = 1, \dots, t, \quad (4.7)$$

which immediately holds from Equation (4.4).

4.4.2. The case of hyper-ellipsoid

Another simple way of modeling IKD is using a hyper-ellipsoid in \mathbb{R}^z , whose set Λ obeys to:

$$\Lambda = \left\{ (x_1, \dots, x_z) \in \mathbb{R}^z \mid \left(\frac{x_1 - P_1^{(0)}}{w_1} \right)^2 + \dots + \left(\frac{x_z - P_z^{(0)}}{w_z} \right)^2 = \sum_{l=1}^z \left(\frac{x_l - P_l^{(0)}}{w_l} \right)^2 \leq 1 \right\}, \quad (4.8)$$

where w_1, \dots, w_z are the semi-diameters or semi-axes of the hyper-ellipsoid contained in a box characterized by $x_1 \in [P_1^{(0)} - w_1, P_1^{(0)} + w_1], \dots, x_z \in [P_z^{(0)} - w_z, P_z^{(0)} + w_z]$. Through the hyper-ellipsoids centered in the (starting) point $P^{(0)} = (P_1^{(0)}, \dots, P_l^{(0)}, \dots, P_z^{(0)})$ and with semi-axes $w_l (\geq 0)$, $l = 1, \dots, z$, we have the following Equation in the boundary:

$$\sum_{l=1}^z \left(\frac{x_l - P_l^{(0)}}{w_l} \right)^2 = 1. \quad (4.9)$$

We can define the hitting point $\hat{P}^{(0)} = (\hat{P}_1^{(0)}, \dots, \hat{P}_l^{(0)}, \dots, \hat{P}_z^{(0)})$ in the boundary of Λ through the centroid of Λ , a vector $d^{(1)}$ with unitary Euclidean norm, and a parameter λ : $\hat{P}_l^{(0)} = P_l^{(0)} + \lambda^{(1)} d_l^{(1)}$, $l = 1, \dots, z$. Given Equation (4.9), we have:

$$\sum_{l=1}^z \left(\frac{(x_l - P_l^{(0)}) + d_l^{(1)} \lambda^{(1)}}{w_l} \right)^2 = \sum_{l=1}^z \frac{(x_l - P_l^{(0)})^2 + (d_l^{(1)})^2 (\lambda^{(1)})^2 + 2(x_l - P_l^{(0)}) d_l^{(1)} \lambda^{(1)}}{(w_l)^2} = 1, \quad (4.10)$$

which can be rearranged as:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \underbrace{\sum_{l=1}^z \left(\frac{d_l^{(1)}}{w_l} \right)^2}_{=\varphi^{(1)}} \left(\lambda^{(1)} \right)^2 + \underbrace{\left(2 \sum_{l=1}^z \frac{(x_l - P_l^{(0)}) d_l^{(1)}}{(w_l)^2} \right)}_{=\psi^{(1)}} \lambda^{(1)} + \underbrace{\sum_{l=1}^z \left(\frac{x_l - P_l^{(0)}}{w_l} \right)^2}_{=\varsigma^{(1)}} - 1 = \\
& = \varphi^{(1)} \left(\lambda^{(1)} \right)^2 + \psi^{(1)} \lambda^{(1)} + \varsigma^{(1)} = 0 \iff \\
& \iff \lambda^{(1)} = \left[-\psi^{(1)} \pm \sqrt{(\psi^{(1)})^2 - 4\varphi^{(1)}\varsigma^{(1)}} \right] / 2\varphi^{(1)},
\end{aligned} \tag{4.11}$$

which holds after using Bhaskara's (quadratic) formula. Equation (4.9) is quadratic. Hence, at the most, there are two different solutions for $\lambda^{(\ell)}$, $\ell = 1, \dots, t$, in Equation (4.12). Therefore, according to Equation (4.11), we select the smallest strictly positive solution for $\lambda^{(\ell)}$.

Figure B.1b portrays the result of 10,000 iterations of the HR procedure applied to the two-dimensional ellipse, centered in the starting point $P^{(0)} = (5, 5)$ with $w_1 = 3$ and $w_2 = 1$. If $\underline{x}_l = P_l^{(0)} - w_l$ and $\bar{x}_l = P_l^{(0)} + w_l$, then we can observe that the hyper-ellipsoid is more restrictive than hyper-boxes to model IKD.

The parameters $\lambda^{(\ell)}$ for the hyper-ellipsoid are in Definition 4.2. It is immediate to conclude that Equation (4.12) results from the generalization of $\lambda^{(1)}$ in Equation (4.11) for the ℓ -th iteration of the HR procedure.

Definition 4.2 (Hyper-ellipsoid in \mathbb{R}^z). The hyper-ellipsoid defined by Equation (4.8) is associated with

$$\lambda^{(\ell)} = \frac{-\psi^{(\ell)} \pm \sqrt{(\psi^{(\ell)})^2 - 4\varphi^{(\ell)}\varsigma^{(\ell)}}}{2\varphi^{(\ell)}}, \text{ s.t. } \begin{cases} \varphi^{(\ell)} = \sum_{l=1}^z \left(\frac{d_l^{(\ell)}}{w_l} \right)^2 \\ \psi^{(\ell)} = 2 \sum_{l=1}^z \frac{(P_l^{(\ell-1)} - P_l^{(0)}) d_l^{(\ell)}}{(w_l)^2} \\ \varsigma^{(\ell)} = -1 + \sum_{l=1}^z \left(\frac{P_l^{(\ell-1)} - P_l^{(0)}}{w_l} \right)^2 \end{cases}. \tag{4.12}$$

4.4.3. The case of hyper-rhombus

Finally, we can also consider the hyper-rhombi for IKD modeling, as shown in Figure B.1c for the rhombus in \mathbb{R}^2 centered in $P^{(0)} = (5, 5)$. Generically, a hyper-rhombus centered in $P^{(0)}$ and has a set Λ defined by:

$$\Lambda = \left\{ (x_1, \dots, x_z) \in \mathbb{R}^z \mid \sum_{l=1}^z \left| \frac{x_l - P_l^{(0)}}{w_l} \right| \leq 1 \right\}. \quad (4.13)$$

Let us consider a (two-dimension) rhombus centered in $P^{(0)} = (P_1^{(0)}, P_2^{(0)})$ and with semi-axis $2w_1$ and $2w_2$. This rhombus is featured by $\left| \frac{x_1 - P_1^{(0)}}{w_1} \right| + \left| \frac{x_2 - P_2^{(0)}}{w_2} \right| \leq 1$, which translates into four constraints ($p = 4$): $\frac{x_1 - P_1^{(0)}}{w_1} + \frac{x_2 - P_2^{(0)}}{w_2} \leq 1$, $\frac{x_1 - P_1^{(0)}}{-w_1} + \frac{x_2 - P_2^{(0)}}{w_2} \leq 1$, $\frac{x_1 - P_1^{(0)}}{w_1} + \frac{x_2 - P_2^{(0)}}{-w_2} \leq 1$, and $\frac{x_1 - P_1^{(0)}}{-w_1} + \frac{x_2 - P_2^{(0)}}{-w_2} \leq 1$. These constraints can be rewritten as follows: $\frac{x_1}{w_1} + \frac{x_2}{w_2} \leq 1 + \frac{P_1^{(0)}}{w_1} + \frac{P_2^{(0)}}{w_2}$, $\frac{x_1}{-w_1} + \frac{x_2}{w_2} \leq 1 + \frac{P_1^{(0)}}{-w_1} + \frac{P_2^{(0)}}{w_2}$, $\frac{x_1}{w_1} + \frac{x_2}{-w_2} \leq 1 + \frac{P_1^{(0)}}{w_1} + \frac{P_2^{(0)}}{-w_2}$, and $\frac{x_1}{-w_1} + \frac{x_2}{-w_2} \leq 1 + \frac{P_1^{(0)}}{-w_1} + \frac{P_2^{(0)}}{-w_2}$, respectively. We have rewritten these constraints in the form of $\sum_{l=1}^2 a_{ql} x_l \leq b_q$, with $b_q = 1 + \sum_{l=1}^2 a_{ql} P_l^{(0)}$ for $q = 1, \dots, 4$. From Equation (4.4) we know that the parameter λ associated with the ℓ -th iteration is as follows:

$$\lambda^{(\ell)} = \min_{\lambda \geq 0} \left\{ \lambda_q = \frac{1 + \sum_{l=1}^2 a_{ql} P_l^{(0)} - \sum_{l=1}^2 a_{ql} P_l^{(\ell-1)}}{\sum_{l=1}^2 a_{ql} d_l^{(\ell)}} = \frac{1 - \sum_{l=1}^2 a_{ql} (P_l^{(\ell-1)} - P_l^{(0)})}{\sum_{l=1}^2 a_{ql} d_l^{(\ell)}}, \quad q = 1, \dots, 4 \right\}, \quad (4.14)$$

where $a_{ql} = 1/[\text{sgn}(a_{ql})w_l]$ (the sign associated with a_{ql} depends on the constraint. Still, it is clear that $|\alpha_{ql}| = 1/w_l$ for $l = 1, 2$ and $q = 1, \dots, 4$). In the present case ($\Lambda \in \mathbb{R}^2$), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_1 &= \left(1 - \left(\frac{1}{w_1} (P_1^{(\ell-1)} - P_1^{(0)}) + \frac{1}{w_2} (P_2^{(\ell-1)} - P_2^{(0)}) \right) \right) / \left(\frac{1}{w_1} d_1^{(\ell)} + \frac{1}{w_2} d_2^{(\ell)} \right), \\ \lambda_2 &= \left(1 - \left(\frac{1}{-w_1} (P_1^{(\ell-1)} - P_1^{(0)}) + \frac{1}{w_2} (P_2^{(\ell-1)} - P_2^{(0)}) \right) \right) / \left(\frac{1}{-w_1} d_1^{(\ell)} + \frac{1}{w_2} d_2^{(\ell)} \right), \\ \lambda_3 &= \left(1 - \left(\frac{1}{w_1} (P_1^{(\ell-1)} - P_1^{(0)}) + \frac{1}{-w_2} (P_2^{(\ell-1)} - P_2^{(0)}) \right) \right) / \left(\frac{1}{w_1} d_1^{(\ell)} + \frac{1}{-w_2} d_2^{(\ell)} \right), \\ \lambda_4 &= \left(1 - \left(\frac{1}{-w_1} (P_1^{(\ell-1)} - P_1^{(0)}) + \frac{1}{-w_2} (P_2^{(\ell-1)} - P_2^{(0)}) \right) \right) / \left(\frac{1}{-w_1} d_1^{(\ell)} + \frac{1}{-w_2} d_2^{(\ell)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Determining the parameter $\lambda^{(\ell)}$ is identical if $z \geq 2$. There are $p = 2^z$ constraints to describe the hyper-rhombus in \mathbb{R}^z . These constraints can be written as $\sum_{l=1}^z a_{ql} x_l \leq b_q$, with $b_q = 1 + \sum_{l=1}^z a_{ql} P_l^{(0)}$ and $a_{ql} = 1/[\pm w_l]$, for $q = 1, \dots, 2^z$.

Definition 4.3 presents the Equation ruling the computation of the parameters $\lambda^{(\ell)}$ for the hyper-rhombi in \mathbb{R}^z .

Definition 4.3 (Hyper-rhombus in \mathbb{R}^z). The hyper-rhombus whose set Λ is defined by Equation (4.13) verifies:

$$\lambda^{(\ell)} = \min_{\lambda \geq 0} \left\{ \lambda_q = \frac{1 - \sum_{l=1}^z a_{ql} (P_l^{(\ell-1)} - P_l^{(0)})}{\sum_{l=1}^z a_{ql} d_l^{(\ell)}}, q = 1, \dots, 2^z \right\}, \ell = 1, \dots, t, \quad (4.15)$$

where $a_{ql} = 1/\pm w_l$, for $q = 1, \dots, 2^z$.

5. DEA under the imperfect knowledge of data: Applying the Hit & Run routine

This section explains how the HR routine can be integrated with DEA for robust efficiency estimates assessment, compares the proposed method with other alternatives, provides insights on how we can make statistical inference using the efficiency estimates, and makes some additional considerations regarding the integrated approach's robustness.

5.1. The integrated algorithm HR+DEA

Using the input and output matrices associated with the n DMUs under evaluation, a benchmarking exercise's main objective consists of estimating the n efficiency scores (or, similarly, distances to the frontier). It is possible if inputs and outputs are known perfectly. Otherwise, in the presence of IKD, a solution can be used to estimate t possible efficiency scores *per* DMU, *i.e.*, by randomly generating a $n \times t$ matrix of possible scores, E , where t is the number of realizations considered for the unknown values.

Indeed, due to the IKD, unobserved or incorrect input/output variables for a particular DMU $k \in J$ can be replaced by a set Λ^k in the $\mathbb{R}_+^m \times \mathbb{R}_+^s \times \mathbb{R}_+^v$ -Euclidean space. As previously mentioned, this set can assume different shapes, such as hyper-boxes or hyper-ellipsoids.

In a perfect knowledge situation, $\Lambda^k \mapsto (x^k, y^k, u^k)$, *i.e.*, the set reduces to a single point in the same Euclidean space. Otherwise, any point within Λ^k is a possible candidate to be a potential observation for DMU k . Since Λ^k is a continuous space, there are infinite potential candidates for k , and the same does apply for each $j \in J$ concerning Λ^j . It means that achieving all potential candidates to cover the entire set requires a

simulation routine with infinite iterations, t , like the one of HR; see Algorithm 1 in Appendix A.² Nonetheless, given the practical limitations of programming tools, the number of iterations must be finite, $t < +\infty$, although this parameter should be large enough to get satisfactory results. We expect no potential accuracy gains due to the increase of t beyond a sufficiently large threshold (typically, a few thousand).

Before starting the HR routine, it is necessary to define n initial points, $(x^{j(0)}, y^{j(0)}, u^{j(0)})$ for each $j \in J$. These initial points must belong to the corresponding set Λ^j . We can, thus, pick any initial or starting point from Λ^j . For the sake of simplicity, the centroids are chosen for such a purpose. Using the centroids points, we can thus construct new inputs and outputs matrices, $(X^{(0)}, Y^{(0)}, U^{(0)})$, and estimate the 0-order frontier, $F^{(0)}$, as well as the corresponding efficiency scores, $D^{j(0)}$, for all $j \in J$, *e.g.*, by using Model (2.1) or Model (2.3).

Consider a DMU $k \in J$, whose efficiency score concerning the frontier F we want to estimate. The HR routine imposes that, for each iteration, ℓ , n new points $(x^{j(\ell)}, y^{j(\ell)}, u^{j(\ell)}) \in \Lambda^j$, $j \in J$, must be estimated. There are as many possible frontiers, $F^{(\ell)}$, as many iterations, t , we have defined at the beginning. Accordingly, there are, at most, t possible efficiency estimates for DMU k . To estimate those points, we propose the following procedure. For each iteration ℓ :

1. Define a vector $d_j^{(\ell)} = (d_j^{x(\ell)}, d_j^{y(\ell)}, d_j^{u(\ell)})$ for all $j \in J$ and such that $\|d_j^{(\ell)}\|_2 = 1$. This vector's entries are randomly selected (with replacement) from the uniform distribution bounded by -1 and $+1$.
2. Following the path defined by $d_j^{(\ell)}$, estimate the distance $\lambda_j^{(\ell)}$ *per* DMU $j \in J$, according to the appropriate Equation provided in Subsection 4.4. This one is, thus, the distance between the point $(x^{j(\ell-1)}, y^{j(\ell-1)}, u^{j(\ell-1)}) \in \Lambda^j$, $j \in J$, that was achieved in the previous iteration, and the boundaries of Λ^j .
3. Construct the line $L_j^{(\ell)}$ for each $j \in J$:

$$L_j^{(\ell)} = \Lambda^j \cap \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} x^{j(\ell)} \\ y^{j(\ell)} \\ u^{j(\ell)} \end{pmatrix}^\top \in \mathbb{R}_+^{m+s+v}, e \in [0, 1] \mid \begin{pmatrix} x^{j(\ell)} \\ y^{j(\ell)} \\ u^{j(\ell)} \end{pmatrix}^\top = \begin{pmatrix} x^{j(\ell-1)} \\ y^{j(\ell-1)} \\ u^{j(\ell-1)} \end{pmatrix}^\top + \lambda_j^{(\ell)} \begin{pmatrix} d_j^{x(\ell)} \\ d_j^{y(\ell)} \\ d_j^{u(\ell)} \end{pmatrix}^\top e \right\}; \quad (5.1)$$

4. Randomly and with reposition, generate n quantities $\xi_j^{(\ell)}$ by following a predefined probability density function, typically uniform. The value of $\xi_j^{(\ell)}$ should be bounded by 0 and 1.

²Appendix available at: https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1jAmKFzz_PWyPKSNTxq0_0mM8BWKWn3-D?usp=sharing

5. Using the previous points $(x^{j(\ell-1)}, y^{j(\ell-1)}, u^{j(\ell-1)})$, the parameters $\xi_j^{(\ell)} \sim f_j$, the vectors $d_j^{(\ell)}$, and the distances $\lambda_j^{(\ell)}$, estimate the set of n new points

$$(x^{j(\ell)}, y^{j(\ell)}, u^{j(\ell)}) = (x^{j(\ell-1)}, y^{j(\ell-1)}, u^{j(\ell-1)}) + \lambda_j^{(\ell)} d_j^{(\ell)} \xi_j^{(\ell)}, \quad j \in J.$$

Once the set of new points have been estimated, we can then construct the new matrices, $(X^{(\ell)}, Y^{(\ell)}, U^{(\ell)})$, as well as the new frontier, $F^{(\ell)}$, and estimate the distance of $(x^{k(\ell)}, y^{k(\ell)}, u^{k(\ell)})$ concerning $F^{(\ell)}$, i.e., $D^{k(\ell)}$. Figure B.3 in Appendix B presents an illustrative example of the HR+DEA integrated approach.³

Note that there are t possibly different estimates of $D^{k(\ell)}$ because $\xi_j^{(\ell)}$ depends on $j \in J$ and the probability density function, f_j , which can also be different for each DMU. Algorithm 2 (in Appendix A) synthesizes the previous details on integrating the HR routine with DEA.

5.2. Some interesting results about the integrated algorithm

Given the formulation of the integrated approach, the following propositions hold. Proposition 5.1 states that, under the perfect knowledge case for all DMUs, the integrated approach HR+DEA delivers the exact same efficiency scores (or distances) as DEA. Therefore, DEA applied to perfect knowledge of data is a particular case of this integrated approach.

Proposition 5.1. The HR+DEA produces the same frontier (and, hence, the same efficiency estimates) as DEA if $\Lambda^j \mapsto (x^j, y^j)$ for all $j \in J$, regardless of the number of iterations, t .

Proof. It is straightforward to conclude that $(\forall j \in J, \Lambda^j \mapsto (x^j, y^j)) \implies \lambda_j^{(\ell)} = 0 \implies (x^{j(\ell)}, y^{j(\ell)}) = (x^{j(\ell-1)}, y^{j(\ell-1)}) = \dots = (x^j, y^j) \implies F^{(\ell-1)} = F^{(\ell)} \implies D^{j(\ell-1)} = D^{j(\ell)} = \dots = D^{j(0)}, \forall \ell = 1, \dots, t. \quad \square$

Proposition 5.2 states that the interval DEA approach, as proposed by Despotis and Smirlis (2002), is a particular case of the proposed integrated approach HR+DEA. In that case, we have to impose $t \mapsto +\infty$ to achieve the efficiency distributions' extremes. Still, in practice it is not possible to impose an infinite loop for the HR procedure. Even if it would be possible, we often truncate those distributions; thus, the limits of interval DEA will rarely be obtained in HR+DEA. It implies that the interval's width for efficiency estimates derived by HR+DEA is smaller than (or equal to) the width achieved by interval DEA.

³Appendix available at: https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1jAmKFzz_PWyPKSNTxq0_0mM8BWKWn3-D?usp=sharing

Proposition 5.2. If $t \mapsto +\infty$ and Λ^j is modeled using hyper-boxes for all $j \in J$, then the extremes of the distributions associated with E^k , $k \in J$, are equal to the ones derived using interval DEA.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{E}^{k(t)} = \{D^{j[1]}, \dots, D^{j[\ell]}, \dots, D^{j[t]}\}$ be the list of sorted efficiency scores (or distances) achieved using t loops, such that $D^{j[1]} \leq \dots \leq D^{j[\ell]} \leq \dots \leq D^{j[t]}$. If Λ^j is modeled using hyper-boxes for all $j \in J$, then $\max \mathcal{E}^{k(t)} (= D^{k[t]})$ for $t \mapsto +\infty$ corresponds to project (\bar{x}^k, \bar{y}^k) in the frontier constructed using $\mathcal{S}^W = \{(x^j, y^j) \in \mathbb{R}_+^m \times \mathbb{R}_+^s \mid x^j = \bar{x}^j, y^j = \bar{y}^j, j \in J\}$ (worst scenario of interval DEA). Likewise, $\min \mathcal{E}^{k(t)} (= D^{k[1]})$ is the distance of $(\underline{x}^k, \underline{y}^k)$ regarding $\mathcal{S}^B = \{(x^j, y^j) \in \mathbb{R}_+^m \times \mathbb{R}_+^s \mid x^j = \underline{x}^j, y^j = \underline{y}^j, j \in J\}$ (best scenario of interval DEA). \square

5.3. On comparing the integrated approach with other alternatives

As previously mentioned, there are few alternatives to account for data imperfect knowledge, either in analyses based on DEA or in any statistical analysis. Regarding DEA, imputation remains one of the preferable alternatives given the dimensionality problem that affects non-parametric benchmarking models. To compare our alternative with others, we ran a Monte-Carlo simulation with 150 iterations. The chosen alternatives were: (i) mean imputation, (ii) hot-deck imputation, (iii) interval DEA, (iv) regression using linear functions, and (v) HR with $t = 100$ iterations using (v_1) hyper-boxes, (v_2) hyper-ellipsoids, and (v_3) hyper-rhombuses to model data imperfect knowledge.

For each Monte-Carlo iteration, we generated 300 DMUs consuming two inputs, $x_1 \sim 10 + 5 \cdot \text{uniform}(0, 1)$ and $x_2 \sim 20 + 10 \cdot \mathcal{N}^+(0, 1)$,⁴ and producing one output, y_1 , which is a function of both x_1 and x_2 . Three scenarios were constructed:

(I) $y_1 \sim 5 \cdot (x_1)^{0.5} \cdot (x_2)^{0.7} \cdot \text{uniform}(0, 1)$;

(II) $y_1 \sim (2 \cdot x_1 + 4 \cdot x_2 + x_1 \cdot x_2) \cdot \mathcal{N}^+(0, \frac{1}{3})$; and

(III) $\log y_1 \sim \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{5} \cdot \log x_1 + \log x_2 + \frac{4}{10} \cdot \log^2 x_1 + \frac{1}{10} \cdot \log^2 x_2 + \frac{3}{10} \cdot \log x_1 \cdot \log x_2 + \log \text{uniform}(0, 1)$.

Then, we estimated the efficiency scores of the whole sample using the output-oriented DEA (Model (2.1) with $\delta^k = (0, y^k)$).

Eighty gaps were randomly introduced into the dataset. The intervals used for the alternatives (iii) and (v) were randomly generated: $w_i^j = x_i^j + 10^{O_i-1} \rho_i$, $i = 1, 2$, and $w_r^j = y_r^j + 10^{O_r-1} \varpi_r$, $r = 1$, where O is the magnitude of the variable and $\rho_i, \varpi_r \sim \text{uniform}(0, 1)$.

⁴ $\mathcal{N}(\rho, \sigma)$ stands for the Gaussian probability density function with mean ρ and standard deviation σ . $\mathcal{N}^+(\rho, \sigma)$ represents the strictly positive observations of the same density function.

We re-estimated the efficiency scores under the presence of IKD through the eight imputation techniques above. To compare the former with the original efficiency scores, we used the following statistics:

- Pearson’s correlation coefficient (the larger, the better);
- Kendall’s correlation coefficient (the larger, the better);
- Mean absolute error (MAE) (the smaller, the better);
- Mean signed difference (MSD) (the smaller, the better).

Table 5.1 presents the main results obtained for the three scenarios and the eight alternatives, using two correlation coefficients and two error metrics. It is immediate to conclude that neither regression nor hot-deck imputations are good alternatives, as they minimize both correlation coefficients and maximize both error metrics (in absolute value). Using a mathematical model to regress data when the production function is unknown is likely to produce biased estimates to substitute imperfectly known data. A similar argument can be used for the imputation based on identical DMUs (hot-deck). We also observe that the three HR alternatives produce similar outcomes and are equally good at modeling IKD. Furthermore, we verify that correlations (resp. error metrics) are larger (resp. smaller) in HR compared to the mean imputation or the interval DEA. However, it may not be sufficient to justify the adoption of an alternative like HR, especially when the other two alternatives are simpler. We remark, though, that HR can introduce a stochastic nature into DEA, allowing statistical inference, as detailed in the next subsections.

5.4. Efficiency as a stochastic variable

Because of IKD, the efficiency cannot be deterministic. Rather, it is necessarily stochastic. Let us assume that we can fit our estimates of D^k to a probability density function from a well-known family of densities, *e.g.*, Gaussian, Weibull, and t -location scale, to name a few. From a finite set of possible functions, we may sort them (concerning their capacity of fitting to the empirical data) using the Bayesian information criterion, the Akaike information criterion, and the log-likelihood. The goodness-of-fit can be easily tested using the non-parametric Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, for instance. Let $f_{D^k}(\mathcal{d})$ be the probability density function associated with the (stochastic) distance of DMU k to the frontier F . The expected value of D^k is as follows:

Definition 5.1 (Expected value of D^k). If Ω^k is the domain of D^k , *i.e.*, $\Omega^k = [\min_{\ell} D^{k(\ell)}, \max_{\ell} D^{k(\ell)}]$, the

Table 5.1: On comparing the Hit & Run approach with other alternatives.

Correlation		Sc. (I)	Sc. (II)	Sc. (III)	Mean	Error		Sc. (I)	Sc. (II)	Sc. (III)	Mean
Pearson	(i)	0.9564	0.9684	0.9793	0.9681		(i)	1.5197	5.2629	1.7957	2.8594
	(ii)	0.6620	0.6931	0.6611	0.6721		(ii)	11.2857	18.4029	15.8846	15.1910
	(iii)	0.9404	0.9449	0.9528	0.9460		(iii)	1.3318	4.7873	2.3864	2.8351
	(iv)	0.7630	0.7915	0.1055	0.5533	MAE ^a	(iv)	3.5707	11.5670	1196.7238	403.9538
	(v ₁)	0.9688	0.9658	0.9750	0.9699		(v ₁)	1.0651	4.4800	1.3666	2.3039
	(v ₂)	0.9790	0.9737	0.9819	0.9782		(v ₂)	1.0228	4.3977	1.2257	2.2154
	(v ₃)	0.9758	0.9777	0.9806	0.9780		(v ₃)	1.0320	4.3235	1.2641	2.2065
Kendall	(i)	0.9945	0.9964	0.9966	0.9959		(i)	-0.3789	-2.7731	-0.3010	-1.1510
	(ii)	0.6113	0.6123	0.6091	0.6109		(ii)	5.0912	-2.2049	2.1883	1.6915
	(iii)	0.9946	0.9965	0.9969	0.9960		(iii)	-0.7558	-3.9770	-0.1579	-1.6303
	(iv)	0.7014	0.6999	0.5554	0.6522	MSD ^b	(iv)	-2.3183	-8.0147	1194.9248	394.8640
	(v ₁)	0.9950	0.9966	0.9970	0.9962		(v ₁)	-0.9081	-4.1164	-0.9186	-1.9810
	(v ₂)	0.9952	0.9967	0.9971	0.9963		(v ₂)	-0.8678	-4.0628	-0.8876	-1.9394
	(v ₃)	0.9952	0.9967	0.9971	0.9963		(v ₃)	-0.8894	-4.0389	-0.8936	-1.9406

^aMean absolute error^bMean signed difference

expected value of these distances to the frontier is as follows:

$$\mathbb{E}(D^k) = \int_{\Omega^k} \mathcal{d} f_{D^k}(\mathcal{d}) d\mathcal{d}. \quad (5.2)$$

Example 5.1 (When $D^k \sim \text{Beta}(\alpha, \beta; q_1, q_2)$ distribution with shape parameters α, β). Suppose that the distance of DMU k to the frontier is a stochastic variable following a Beta distribution. Note that the Beta distribution considered here has support in $\mathcal{d} \in [q_1, q_2]$. In that case, should α and β be two non-negative shape parameters, then (Nadarajah, 2006):

$$f_{D^k}(\mathcal{d}) = \frac{1}{(q_2 - q_1)B(\alpha, \beta)} \left(\frac{\mathcal{d} - q_1}{q_2 - q_1} \right)^{\alpha-1} \left(1 - \frac{\mathcal{d} - q_1}{q_2 - q_1} \right)^{\beta-1}, \quad (5.3)$$

being $B(\alpha, \beta) = \frac{\Gamma(\alpha)\Gamma(\beta)}{\Gamma(\alpha+\beta)}$ the Euler's Beta function and Γ the gamma function. The indefinite integral of

d $f_{D^k}(d)$ as in Equation (5.2) is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} I(d, q_1, q_2; \alpha, \beta) &= \int d f_{D^k}(d) dd = \\ &= \frac{\left(\frac{q_1 - d}{q_1 - q_2}\right)^\alpha}{\alpha\beta B(\alpha, \beta)} \left[(\beta q_1 + \alpha q_2) {}_2F_1\left(\alpha; -\beta; 1 + \alpha; \frac{q_1 - d}{q_1 - q_2}\right) - \alpha q_2 \left(\frac{d - q_2}{q_1 - q_2}\right)^\beta \right], \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

being ${}_2F_1$ the Gauss hypergeometric function. Therefore, the expected value of D^k is simply:

$$\mathbb{E}(D^k) = I\left(\max_\ell D^{k(\ell)}, q_1, q_2; \alpha, \beta\right) - I\left(\min_\ell D^{k(\ell)}, q_1, q_2; \alpha, \beta\right), \quad (5.5)$$

as a result of the Newton-Leibniz axiom (*i.e.*, the second fundamental theorem of calculus). The definite integral in the domain of the Beta distribution gives us the following output:

$$\mathbb{E}(D^k) = \int_{q_1}^{q_2} d f_{D^k}(d) dd = \frac{\beta q_1 + \alpha q_2}{B(\alpha, \beta)} \frac{\Gamma(\alpha)\Gamma(\beta)}{\Gamma(1 + \alpha + \beta)}. \quad (5.6)$$

Naturally, if $q_1 = 0$, $q_2 = 1$, $\max_\ell D^{k(\ell)} = 1$, and $\min_\ell D^{k(\ell)} = 0$, we have $\mathbb{E}(D^k) = \frac{\alpha}{\alpha + \beta}$, which is the well-known expected value of a Beta distribution with shape parameters α, β .

Remark 5.1. The Taylor's expansion of the Beta distribution shows that, for sufficiently large shape parameters such that $(\alpha + 1)/(\alpha - 1) \approx 1$ and $(\beta + 1)/(\beta - 1) \approx 1$, then the Beta distribution can be approximated by a Gaussian distribution, \mathcal{N} , with mean ρ and standard deviation σ (Peizer and Pratt, 1968):

$$X \sim \text{Beta}(\alpha, \beta); Y \sim \mathcal{N}(\rho, \sigma) \text{ and } \alpha, \beta \gg 0 \implies X \approx Y, \quad (5.7)$$

such that:

$$\begin{cases} \rho = \frac{\alpha}{\alpha + \beta}, \text{ and} \\ \sigma = \sqrt{\frac{\alpha\beta}{(\alpha + \beta)^2(\alpha + \beta + 1)}}. \end{cases} \quad (5.8)$$

Of course, the expected value of the Gaussian distribution is equal to ρ , which should take the form mentioned in Equation (5.8).

Sometimes an efficiency score, rather than the distance to the frontier, is desirable. If the distance D^k would

be deterministic, we could derive a deterministic efficiency score, θ^k , as follows:

Definition 5.2 ((Deterministic) Efficiency score, θ^k). We may define efficiency as the relationship between the consumed inputs and the produced outputs of a DMU. More precisely, efficiency measures the relationship between (optimal) targets and observations. Mathematically, the (deterministic) efficiency score of DMU k can be estimated as in [Portela and Thanassoulis \(2006\)](#), [Ferreira and Marques \(2016\)](#), and [Ferreira et al. \(2017\)](#):

$$\theta^k = \frac{\left(\prod_{i=1}^m \frac{(x_i^k)^*}{x_i^k} \right)^{\frac{1}{m}}}{\left(\prod_{r=1}^s \frac{(y_r^k)^*}{y_r^k} \right)^{\frac{1}{s}}} = \frac{\left(\prod_{i=1}^m \frac{x_i^k - \delta_i^x \cdot D^k}{x_i^k} \right)^{\frac{1}{m}}}{\left(\prod_{r=1}^s \frac{y_r^k + \delta_r^y \cdot D^k}{y_r^k} \right)^{\frac{1}{s}}}, \quad (5.9)$$

where the numerators $(x_i^k)^* = x_i^k - \delta_i^x \cdot D^k$ ($\leq x_i^k$) and $(y_r^k)^* = y_r^k + \delta_r^y \cdot D^k$ ($\geq y_r^k$), for $i = 1, \dots, m$ and $r = 1, \dots, s$, respectively, are the targets of inputs and outputs.

Remark 5.2. In line with [Chambers et al. \(1996, 1998\)](#), it is usual to fix $(\delta_i^x, \delta_r^y, \delta_h^u) = (x_i^k, y_r^k, u_h^k)$ for any i, r, h . In that case, Equation (5.9) simplifies to

$$\theta^k = \frac{1 - D^k}{1 + D^k}. \quad (5.10)$$

From the simulations of the integrated approach, we cannot estimate the expected value of efficiency, $\mathbb{E}(\Theta^k)$, by simply replacing D^k by $\mathbb{E}(D^k)$ in Equations (5.9-5.10). It is because D^k is a stochastic variable with density f_{D^k} . We detail below how to estimate $\mathbb{E}(\Theta^k)$ based on the density of $\Theta^k = \frac{1-D^k}{1+D^k} \sim f_{\Theta^k}(\theta^k)$, which should depend on f_{D^k} .

If $W = X + Y$ is a random continuous variable resulting from the summation of two random continuous and independent variables, X and Y , its probability density function is the convolution of the two densities:⁵

$$f_W(w) = f_X(x) * f_Y(y) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} f_X(x) f_Y(w - x) dx, \quad (5.11)$$

where $*$ denotes convolution. If X is a constant (equal to 1 in the present case), its density is the Dirac's delta

⁵Here and in the next few Equations, X , Y , and U have nothing to do with the matrices of inputs, desirable outputs, and undesirable outputs, *i.e.*, the observations plagued with IKD. They are just random variables with densities.

function:

$$f_X(x-1) = \begin{cases} +\infty, & \text{if } x = 1 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (5.12)$$

In this case, the convolution between $f_Y(y)$ and $f_X(x-1)$ is $f_Y(y-1)$ (Schwartz, 1950, 1951). In the same vein, if $Z = X - Y$ is a random continuous variable resulting from the subtraction of two random continuous and independent variables, we have:

$$f_Z(z) = f_X(x) * f_{-Y}(y) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} f_X(x) f_{-Y}(z-x) dx = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} f_X(x) f_Y(x-z) dx. \quad (5.13)$$

Being $X = 1$ a constant, the convolution between $f_{-Y}(y)$ and $f_X(x-1)$ is $f_{-Y}(y-1) = f_Y(1-y)$. From Equation (5.10), we want to estimate the density of the random variable $U = Z(X, Y)/W(X, Y)$, such that $X \equiv 1$ and $Y \equiv D^k$. Following Fieller (1932) and Curtiss (1941), if Z and W are independent, then $U = Z/W \sim f_U(u)$, with:

$$f_U(u) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} |z| f_W(uz) f_Z(z) dz = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} |z| f_Y(1-uz) f_Y(z-1) dz. \quad (5.14)$$

Because of Equations (5.10) and (5.14), the following Definition holds:

Definition 5.3 (Probability density function of Θ^k). The density of $\Theta^k = \frac{1-D^k}{1+D^k}$ depends on the density of D^k as follows:

$$f_{\Theta^k}(\theta) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} |\eta| f_{D^k}(1-\theta\eta) f_{D^k}(\eta-1) d\eta = \int_0^{+\infty} \eta f_{D^k}(1-\theta\eta) f_{D^k}(\eta-1) d\eta - \int_{-\infty}^0 \eta f_{D^k}(1-\theta\eta) f_{D^k}(\eta-1) d\eta. \quad (5.15)$$

Example 5.2 (When $D^k \sim \text{Beta}(\alpha, \beta; 0, 1)$). Suppose that $D^k \sim \text{Beta}(\alpha, \beta; 0, 1)$ distribution with shape parameters α, β . The mirror-image symmetry of the Beta distribution allows us to conclude that $D^k \sim \text{Beta}(\alpha, \beta; 0, 1) \iff 1 - D^k = X \sim \text{Beta}(\beta, \alpha; 0, 1)$. Furthermore, we know from convolution with a Dirac's delta that $1+D^k = Y \sim f_Y(y)$, which has support in $-1 \leq y \leq 0$. Therefore, $f_{\Theta^k}(\theta) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} |y| f_X(\theta y) f_Y(y) dy = \int_{-1}^0 |y| f_X(\theta y) f_Y(y) dy$, with $f_X(\theta y) = \frac{\theta^{\beta-1} y^{\beta-1} (1-\theta y)^{\alpha-1}}{B(\alpha, \beta)}$ and $f_Y(y) = \frac{y^{\beta-1} (1+y)^{\alpha-1}}{B(\alpha, \beta)}$. We finally get the following

expression for $f_{\Theta^k}(\theta)$:⁶

$$f_{\Theta^k}(\theta) = -(-1)^{1+2\beta} \frac{\theta^{\beta-1}}{B^2(\alpha, \beta)} \frac{\Gamma(\alpha)\Gamma(2\beta)}{\Gamma(\alpha+2\beta)} {}_2F_1(1-\alpha; 2\beta; \alpha+2\beta; -\theta). \quad (5.16)$$

Example 5.3 (When $D^k \sim \mathcal{N}(\rho, \sigma)$, a Gaussian distribution with parameters ρ, σ). Suppose that $D^k \sim \mathcal{N}(\rho, \sigma)$, where ρ and σ are, respectively, the mean and the standard deviation of the Gaussian distribution, \mathcal{N} . Then, $1 - D^k \sim \mathcal{N}(1 - \rho, \sigma)$ and $1 + D^k \sim \mathcal{N}(1 + \rho, \sigma)$. Following [Pham-Gia et al. \(2006\)](#), we may use Hermite functions to solve Equation (5.15) and get $(1 - D^k)/(1 + D^k) \sim f_{\Theta^k}(\theta)$, with:

$$f_{\Theta^k}(\theta) = \frac{T}{1 + \theta^2} {}_1F_1\left(1; \frac{1}{2}; \omega(\theta)\right), \quad (5.17)$$

being ${}_1F_1$ the Kummer's classical confluent hypergeometric function of first kind ([Campos, 2001](#)), and:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} T = \frac{1}{\pi} \exp\left[-\frac{(1-\rho)^2 + (1+\rho)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right], \\ \text{and} \\ \omega(\theta) = \frac{(1+\rho)^2 + (1-\rho)^2\theta^2 + 2(1-\rho)(1+\rho)\theta}{2\sigma^2(1+\theta^2)}. \end{array} \right. \quad (5.18)$$

Suppose that ρ and σ are defined as functions of α and β , shape parameters of a Beta distribution, according to the Equation (5.8). Because of Remark 5.1, Equations (5.16) and (5.17) return similar values should $\alpha, \beta \gg 1$.

As in the case of D^k , we usually need the expected value of the efficiency, $\mathbb{E}(\Theta^k)$. The next definition provides the equation for the expected value of Θ^k , which also depends on the density of D^k :

Definition 5.4 (Expected value of Θ^k). The expected value of Θ^k in the domain $\theta \in]0, 1]$ is:

$$\mathbb{E}(\Theta^k) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \theta f_{\Theta^k}(\theta) d\theta = \int_0^1 \theta f_{\Theta^k}(\theta) d\theta = \int_0^1 \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \theta |\varphi| f_{D^k}(1 - \theta\varphi) f_{D^k}(\varphi - 1) d\varphi d\theta. \quad (5.19)$$

Remark 5.3. Let $\rho = \mathbb{E}(D^k)$. Equation (5.19) does not return $(1 - \rho)/(1 + \rho)$ that would result from replacing D^k by its expected value in Equation (5.10). Indeed, following [Stuart and Ord \(2010\)](#), we may use the second order Taylor expansion over the ratio $(1 - D^k)/(1 + D^k)$ in the point $(1 - \rho, 1 + \rho)$ to approximate the expected

⁶We used the software Wolfram Mathematica 12.1 (<https://www.wolfram.com/mathematica/>) to integrate.

value $\mathbb{E}(\Theta^k)$ of Equation (5.19), as follows:

$$\mathbb{E}(\Theta^k) = \frac{1-\rho}{1+\rho} - \frac{\text{Cov}(1-D^k, 1+D^k)}{(1+\rho)^2} + \frac{(1-\rho)\text{Var}(1+D^k)}{(1+\rho)^3}. \quad (5.20)$$

where Cov is the covariance between two random variables, and Var is the variance. Naturally, $\text{Cov}(1-D^k, 1+D^k) = \text{Cov}(-D^k, D^k) = -\text{Cov}(D^k, D^k) = -\text{Var}(D^k)$. Also, let us use σ^2 to denote $\text{Var}(1+D^k)$ or $\text{Var}(D^k)$, interchangeably. Therefore, Equation (5.20) becomes:

$$\mathbb{E}(\Theta^k) = \frac{1-\rho}{1+\rho} + \left[\frac{1}{(1+\rho)^2} + \frac{1-\rho}{(1+\rho)^3} \right] \sigma^2, \quad (5.21)$$

Suppose that $\rho = \sigma = 0$. In that case, $\mathbb{E}(\Theta^k) = 1$, meaning that the DMU k is efficient.

5.5. Additional definitions regarding the robustness analysis of the integrated approach

Some additional definitions and remarks concerning the integrated approach's robustness analysis can be obtained from the iterating-based efficiency estimates. Based on the works of [Tervonen and Lahdelma \(2007\)](#), [Tervonen and Figueira \(2008\)](#), and [Kadziński et al. \(2017\)](#), let us consider the following three definitions:

Definition 5.5 (Bucket, b_g , $g = 0, 1, \dots, G$). The bucket b_g for $g = 0, 1, \dots, G$ is an interval of efficiency (or distance D^{*j} , $j \in J$, to the frontier, F) such that $b_g =]\underline{b}_g, \bar{b}_g]$, $b_g \cap b_{g+1} = \emptyset$ and $\bar{b}_g - \underline{b}_g = \bar{b}_{g+1} - \underline{b}_{g+1}$ for any $g = 0, 1, \dots, G-1$, and $\bigcup_{g=0}^G b_g = \left[\min_{j \in J} D^{*j}, \max_{j \in J} D^{*j} \right]$.

Definition 5.6 (Efficiency bucket, b_0). The efficiency bucket is defined by a single point in \mathbb{R} : $b_0 = \{0\}$.

By Definition 5.5, $\bigcup_{g=1}^G b_g \triangleq [\min_{j \in J} D^{*j}, \max_{j \in J} D^{*j}]$. If the frontier empirically estimated by DEA envelops the entire sample, then $\min_{j \in J} D^{*j} = 0$, and the lower end of that range and b_0 overlap. If, due to IKD, some of the admissible points belonging to Λ^j for some $j \in J$ fall outside the frontier, then $\min_{j \in J} D^{*j} < 0$ and DMU j is said to be super-efficient. Nonetheless, in the worst scenario, at least one of the remaining DMUs in $J \setminus j$ is technically efficient (otherwise, we would have no frontier), and $\max_{j \in J} D^{*j} \geq 0$; thus, $b_0 \cap \bigcup_{g=0}^G b_g \neq \emptyset$ and $b_0 \subset \bigcup_{g=1}^G b_g$. Finally, if all observations are technically efficient, then $\min_{j \in J} D^{*j} = \max_{j \in J} D^{*j}$ for all $j \in J$, and $b_0 \equiv \bigcup_{g=1}^G b_g \implies b_0 \subseteq \bigcup_{g=0}^G b_g$.

Remark 5.4. The efficiency bucket verifies the condition $b_0 \subseteq \bigcup_{g=0}^G b_g$.

It is usually desirable to study the frequency (either relative or absolute) in which a DMU k verifies an

efficiency score (or distance to the frontier) belonging to a certain bucket. Such a frequency gives us the probability of observing such a performance for that DMU in the presence of IKD:

Definition 5.7 (Efficiency robustness interval index of DMU $k \in J$, ERII_g^k). The efficiency robustness interval index of DMU k measures the number of times (in relation to t) that this DMU belongs to the bucket $b_g =]\underline{b}_g, \bar{b}_g]$:

$$\text{ERII}_g^k = \Pr(D^k \in b_g) = \Pr(\underline{b}_g < D^k \leq \bar{b}_g) = \frac{1}{t} \sum_{\ell=1}^t \mathbb{I}(\underline{b}_g < D^{k(\ell)} \leq \bar{b}_g), \quad g = 0, 1, \dots, G. \quad (5.22)$$

Remark 5.5. Since the indicator function \mathbb{I} either is equal to 0 or 1, it follows that $\text{ERII}_g^k \geq 0$ for any $g = 0, 1, \dots, G$ and $k \in J$.

Remark 5.6. It is straightforward to conclude that $\sum_{g=0}^G \text{ERII}_g^k = 1$.

Remark 5.7. It is easy to see that

$$\mathbb{E}(D^k) \approx \sum_{g=0}^G \frac{\max b_g + \min b_g}{2} \cdot \text{ERII}_g^k = 0 \cdot \text{ERII}_0^k + \sum_{g=1}^G \frac{\max b_g + \min b_g}{2} \cdot \text{ERII}_g^k = \sum_{g=1}^G \frac{\max b_g + \min b_g}{2} \cdot \text{ERII}_g^k, \quad (5.23)$$

in which the approximation follows the Riemann-Darboux approach over the integration of Equation (5.2), holding if the buckets' width is not too big. It follows that we can approximate $\mathbb{E}(\Theta^k)$ using ERII_g^k and the buckets, as well.

If $\text{ERII}_g^k = 1$ for $g = 0$, then $\mathbb{E}(D^k) \approx 0$ by the Equation (5.23).

Remark 5.8. Because of the non-negativity of ERII_g^k , see Remark 5.5, it follows that $\mathbb{E}(D^k) \geq 0$. The lower bound, 0, means efficiency.

Although useful in many situations, the scores $\mathbb{E}(D^k)$ and $\mathbb{E}(\theta^k)$ tell just a little about the robustness of efficiency estimates. It is common to associate the expected value with a confidence interval with a specified level. Let us consider only the confidence interval associated with the distance:

Definition 5.8 (Confidence interval, Δ_τ^k). Let $\{D^{k[1]}, \dots, D^{k[\ell]}, \dots, D^{k[t]}\}$ be the list of sorted efficiency scores (or distances) achieved using t loops, such that $D^{k[1]} \leq \dots \leq D^{k[\ell]} \leq \dots \leq D^{k[t]}$. The τ -level confidence interval associated with D^k is $\Delta_\tau^k = [D^{k[(1-\tau)t/2]}, D^{k[(1+\tau)t/2]}]$, for $0 < \tau < 1$.

For instance, the 95% confidence interval ($\tau = 0.95$) associated with D^k , for $t = 5,000$, is $\Delta_{0.95}^k =$

$[D^{k[125]}, D^{k[4,875]}]$:

$$\Delta_{0.95}^k = [LB_{95\%}^k, UB_{95\%}^k] = \begin{cases} LB_{95\%}^k = D^{k[125]} \\ UB_{95\%}^k = D^{k[4,875]} \end{cases}, \quad (5.24)$$

where LB and UB stand, respectively, for the *lower bound* and the *upper bound* of the DMU k 's confidence interval associated with the distance to the frontier.

Besides, it is usually useful to classify DMUs based on their performance. We hereby classify them in the following categories:

C_1 : Perfectly robust efficient;

C_2 : Sufficiently robust efficient;

C_3 : Neither robust efficient nor inefficient;

C_4 : Inefficient.

If “ $A \succ B$ ” denotes A is preferable to B , then it is straightforward to conclude that $C_1 \succ C_2 \succ C_3 \succ C_4$. For this classification, it is sufficient to fix the confidence level $\tau \in]0, 1[$, and know ERII_g^k (for $g = 0$), $\mathbb{E}(D^k)$ or $\mathbb{E}(\theta^k)$, and the confidence interval Δ_τ^k .

Definition 5.9 (Perfectly robust efficient DMU). The DMU k is perfectly robust efficient if (and only if) $\mathbb{E}(D^k) = 0$ or $\mathbb{E}(\theta^k) = 1$. It is usually sufficient to have $\text{ERII}_g^k = 1$ for $g = 0$, or $\Delta_\tau^k = \{0\}$ for any $\tau \rightarrow 1$.

Definition 5.10 (Sufficiently robust efficient DMU). The DMU k is sufficiently robust efficient if $\tau \leq \text{ERII}_g^k < 1$, for $g = 0$ and a predefined level $\tau \in]0, 1[$, which can be the same of the confidence interval.

Definition 5.11 (Neither robust efficient nor inefficient DMU). The DMU k is neither robust efficient nor inefficient if (and only if) both the following conditions are met: (i) $\text{ERII}_g^k < \tau$ for $g = 0$; (ii) $\Delta_\tau^k \supset \{0\}$ and $\Delta_\tau^k \neq \{0\}$. The second condition is equivalent of $LB_{95\%} \leq 0$ and $UB_{95\%} > 0$.

Definition 5.12 (Inefficient DMU). To be inefficient, it is sufficient that DMU k verifies $LB_\tau^k > 0$ and $\mathbb{E}(D^k) > 0$.

For a pair of DMUs, j and k , belonging to the same category, the next definitions hold:

Definition 5.13 (Efficiency similarity between two DMUs j and k). Suppose that a pair of DMUs, j and k , belong to the same category and $\Delta_\tau^j \cap \Delta_\tau^k \neq \emptyset$ (their confidence intervals are not disjoint). Then, there is no evidence that one DMU outperforms the other. Symbolically, neither $j \succ k$ nor $k \succ j$.

Definition 5.14 (Outperformance). Consider a pair of DMUs, j and k , belonging to the same category and such that their confidence intervals are disjoint: $\Delta_\tau^j \cap \Delta_\tau^k = \emptyset$. Thus, j outperforms k (*i.e.*, $j \succ k$) if $UB_\tau^j < LB_\tau^k$.

5.6. Probability of a DMU outperforming other DMU

We have previously shown how to check whether a DMU, j , outperforms other DMU, k , if they are both in the same efficiency category. It is based on the intersection of their confidence intervals associated with the distances to the frontier. In some empirical cases, though, it might be useful to determine the probability of DMU j outperforming DMU k , *i.e.*, $\Pr(D^j < D^k) = \Pr(D^j - D^k \leq 0)$, where \leq holds if we assume that the difference $D^{j,k} = D^j - D^k$ is a continuous variable.

We could simply determine the number of times that $D^j - D^k \leq 0$ in our simulation, obtaining:

$$\Pr(D^j < D^k) \approx \frac{1}{t} \sum_{\ell=1}^t \mathbb{I}(D^j - D^k \leq 0) = \frac{1}{t} \sum_{\ell=1}^t \mathbb{I}(D^{j,k} \leq 0), \quad (5.25)$$

which is just an approximation of the *true* probability because of the simulation process.

We prefer a more formal and elegant solution, which should account for the densities associated with each random variable related to the distance to the frontier. Let $f_{D^{j,k}}$ be the probability density function of $D^{j,k}$. Such a function is associated with the cumulative distribution function, \mathcal{F}_D , such that:

$$\mathcal{F}_D(d) = \Pr(D^{j,k} \leq d) = \int_{-\infty}^d f_{D^{j,k}}(w) dw. \quad (5.26)$$

Since we need to estimate $\Pr(D^j < D^k) = \Pr(D^j - D^k \leq 0) = \Pr(D^{j,k} \leq 0)$, we have: $\Pr(D^j < D^k) = \mathcal{F}_D(0)$. The major difficulty here is that we do not know the function $f_{D^{j,k}}$, although we may know both f_{D^k} and f_{D^j} , the probability density functions of D^k and D^j , respectively. However, we may recall Equation (5.13). Using the definition of cumulative distribution function in Equation (5.26), we get:

$$\mathcal{F}_D(d) = \Pr(D^{j,k} \leq d) = \int_{-\infty}^d \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} f_{D^j}(g) f_{D^k}(g - g') dg dg', \quad (5.27)$$

for $D^{j,k} = D^j - D^k$. The Equation above can only be used if D^j and D^k are independent. If it is not the case, we have to consider the joint probability distribution, $f_{D^j D^k}(g, g')$, which may not be straightforward to

get. Independence seems, however, a fair hypothesis. Finally, we obtain the value of $\Pr(D^j < D^k)$ by simply replacing $d = 0$ in Equation (5.27).

Example 5.4 (When the distances to the frontier follow (independent) Gaussian distributions). Suppose that $D^k \sim \mathcal{N}(\rho^k, \sigma^k)$ and $D^j \sim \mathcal{N}(\rho^j, \sigma^j)$, where ρ and σ denote the average and the standard deviation of the estimates D^k and D^j , respectively. \mathcal{N} is the Gaussian distribution, as usual. We assume that D^j and D^k are independent random variables. Then, $D^{j,k} = D^j - D^k \sim \mathcal{N}(\rho^j - \rho^k, \sqrt{(\sigma^j)^2 + (\sigma^k)^2})$. Using the Fourier transform, it is possible to show that Equation (5.27) for $d = 0$ reduces to $\mathcal{F}_D(0) = \Pr(D^{j,k} \leq 0) = \Phi\left(\frac{-(\rho^j - \rho^k)}{\sqrt{(\sigma^j)^2 + (\sigma^k)^2}}\right)$, being Φ the cumulative distribution function of the standard Gaussian distribution. Of course, for other, more general, densities such a simplification is not that simple, requiring the double integration undertaken by the Equation (5.27).

5.7. Testing for differences in global results

In many cases, researchers are interested on testing the influence of some parameters on efficiency, in a controlled way, for robustness purposes. In the present case, for example, we may test for the influence of the shape or the size of Λ for modeling IKD on efficiency. We recall that the convex polytopes defining Λ depend on a set of parameters a_{ql} and b_q , creating a pair (a, b) that may influence D^j for any $j \in J$. We denote $D^j(a, b)$ as the distance of DMU j as function of the pair (a, b) . Naturally, a change on one of these parameters may impact on D^j . Let us formulate the null hypothesis:

$$H_0: D^j(a, b) = D^j(a, b') \text{ for all } j \in J,$$

in which $b' \neq b$. If the change of parameter b to b' does not produce effects over the distances to the frontier (and the frontier itself), then the null hypothesis is *true* as there is no evidence to reject it for a given significance level, say 5%. For any null hypothesis, there is an alternative against which the former is confronted. We may define this alternative as an inequality:

$$H_1: D^j(a, b) \neq D^j(a, b') \text{ for some } j \in J.^7$$

Thus, if changes on the shape/size of Λ impact on efficiency, we should reject H_0 in light of evidence, thus not rejecting H_1 .⁸

⁷Of course, other alternatives are possible, namely $D^j(a, b) > D^j(a, b')$ or $D^j(a, b) < D^j(a, b')$, turning the p-value computation slightly different from the one presented in this paper.

⁸Please, note that we do not accept an hypothesis because all depend on the significance level fixed and the simulation undertaken; the best we can say is that we do not reject it in light of the existing statistical evidence.

A straightforward way of testing H_0 is using the p-value. We can take advantage of the t estimates of distances per DMU. Let us consider the following statistic:⁹

$$T^{(\ell)} = \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n D^{j(\ell)}(a, b) \right) / \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n D^{j(\ell)}(a, b') \right), \ell = 1, \dots, t. \quad (5.28)$$

Note that other averages could be used rather than the simple mean of distances. Generically, except for the geometric mean (because distances can be zero), any Hölder mean might replace either the numerator, the denominator, or both in the previous Equation. Finally, since the alternative hypothesis, H_1 , represents a difference, the p-value can be defined as follows:

$$\text{p-value} \approx \frac{2}{t} \min \left\{ \sum_{\ell=1}^t \mathbb{I}(T^{(\ell)} \leq 1), \sum_{\ell=1}^t \mathbb{I}(T^{(\ell)} \geq 1) \right\}. \quad (5.29)$$

If the p-value is smaller than the fixed significance level (typically, 5%), we reject the null hypothesis, meaning that the shape/size of Λ play a meaningful role on efficiency assessment. In opposition, for p-value $\geq 5\%$, we do not have sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis, so Λ has no impact on efficiency estimation.

6. An empirical application

This section presents an empirical application of the HR procedure integrated with DEA to assess a sample of 108 Portuguese public hospitals' technical efficiency. Model (2.1) could be used to estimate their efficiencies, if no undesirable outputs had to be considered. However, evaluating hospitals' performance often requires considering undesirable outputs resulting from the production process, which are sometimes unavoidable. The smaller the produced amount of this kind of output, the better the performance of the hospital. Some approaches, including transforming of these quantities into desirable outputs, have been proposed in the literature (Zanella et al., 2015). Transforming outputs does not seem the right approach, at least in the present case, due to two reasons. First, no consensus exists on which kind of transformation should be used. Second, neither of the possible transformations should return quantities with meaning. Therefore, we apply the model in Equation (2.3) that disregards the transformation of outputs for the efficiency estimation.

⁹Naturally, other statistics could be used instead; an example is the harmonic mean. In this case, the geometric mean is not advisable because distances are zero for efficient DMUs.

6.1. Sample, inputs, and outputs

This section illustrates the HR procedure's utilization to estimate the efficiency of a sample of 27 Portuguese public hospitals, that provided consistent data for four consecutive years: 2013 to 2016.

Hospital data are available in a database maintained by the Ministry of Health and the Portuguese Central Administration of Health Systems.¹⁰ Even though Portugal is a small country, the database is very rich in terms of measured indicators. Thus, the choice of inputs and outputs must be careful and parsimonious. These dimensions should also explain the hospital activity. Figure 6.1 presents the adopted inputs and outputs (both desirable and undesirable) to execute the integration of HR with Model (2.3).




Figure 6.1: Inputs, outputs, and undesirable outputs.

Inputs characterize the resources consumed by hospitals to treat patients. Considering only the number of beds and the number of doctors and nurses is, in theory, insufficient to explain the profile of resource consumption. Hence, we include operational expenditures as extra input. It excludes the costs with staff to mitigate the problem of redundancy.

Outputs are measures of the hospital activity, regardless of the outcomes (Pereira et al., 2020). This activity

¹⁰Database: <http://benchmarking.acss.min-saude.pt> [in Portuguese], accessed: September 20, 2020.

is related to the hospital's primary services: inpatients, medical appointments, emergency room, and operating theater (surgeries). As the complexity and severity of illness differ from patient to patient, each patient has a different cost of treatment. Hence, an adjustment mechanism is compulsory for the volume of services. In this case, we adopt the case-mix index (McRae and Brunner, 2020). To compute the case-mix index, patients are clustered in diagnosis-related groups; patients belonging to a particular group of diagnoses are expected to represent similar hospital costs. The case-mix index associated with a hospital reflects the average cost of treating its patients relative to the national average unitary cost (Chang and Zhang, 2019). Therefore, the larger the index, the more complex/severe patients are handled by the hospital. The Portuguese Ministry of Health considers three case-mix indices: inpatient, medical, and surgical specialties. Outputs were adjusted (weighted) accordingly to these indices, such that the volume of services became comparable among hospitals.

To evaluate the association between technical efficiency and quality, Ferreira and Marques (2018) and Ferreira et al. (2020b,a) have considered dimensions such as: readmission rate within the first 30 days after discharge; non-urgent first medical appointments within the legislated maximum guaranteed time; outpatient (minor/ambulatory) surgeries on the potential outpatient procedures; the in-hospital death rate for low severity levels; operating theater capacity utilization; and waiting time before surgery, to name a few. Because of the convexity imposed by the fourth restriction of Model (2.3), those rates cannot be considered as extra variables (Olesen et al., 2017). Thus, we have used the raw data associated with those ratios to define the undesirable outputs for this analysis. For instance, the in-hospital death rate is computed using the ratio number of deaths in hospital wards per 100 inpatients. In this case, we use the number of deaths as the undesirable output, considering only the less severe cases because of their lower mortality likelihood. Additionally, we considered:

- a) the *number of readmissions within the first 30 days after discharge from the inpatient service* – this dimension identifies lack of care appropriateness and, likely, patients' safety;
- b) the *number of first medical appointments delayed beyond the legislated maximum guaranteed time*, which constitutes a barrier to access;
- c) the *number of cases solved by major surgery but that could be solved using ambulatory (minor) procedure* – ambulatory surgeries are less costly and more appropriate/safe to the patient requiring only minor procedures;
- d) the *unused time of the operating theater*, which reveals non-optimization of resources usage; and

- e) the *waiting time before surgery*, measured by the number of total days spent by patients waiting for a (non-urgent) surgery, once admitted to the hospital ward.

Using these undesirable outputs we may account for the preventable adverse events that result from unsafe and inappropriate care (Rothschild et al., 2006; McCradden et al., 2020; Braspenning et al., 2020), as well as the existence of some barriers to access. All raise costs to the health service (Andel et al., 2012; Classen et al., 2011; Umscheid et al., 2011).

As outputs, these undesirable quantities must be adjusted for the complexity/severity of illness of the patients treated by each hospital. However, we should point out that hospitals handling more complex patients are also more prone to observe adverse events (*e.g.*, inpatients in severe conditions are more likely to decease than the others, less complicated). Hence, instead of multiply undesirable outputs by the case-mix index (which would lead to unfair comparisons), we divided them by it.

6.2. Methodological considerations

We made two considerations to estimate the technical efficiency of Portuguese public hospitals:

- a) Given the small size of Portugal, there is a limited number of public hospitals (our sample is composed of 27 hospitals). There is a dimensionality limitation associated with the sample's size, which means that small samples will likely result in low discrimination results. To mitigate this shortcoming of the linear model (2.3), we pooled the data collected for the four years and constructed a common frontier, against which the efficiency of hospitals was estimated. It is equivalent to assume that no technological progress or regress was observed during that period. This assumption can be considered acceptable because the time lag is not considerable. The frontier is, thus, constructed using $27 \times 4 = 108$ DMUs.
- b) Principal Component Analysis (PCA) was used to narrow down the number of variables (one input, one output, and one undesirable output). It is a widely used technique to mitigate the problem of data redundancy. If two variables are highly and positively correlated, then using one instead of the other will not likely produce different outcomes (they are redundant). However, considering them could not be the right solution because of the dimensionality problem associated with non-parametric benchmarking models. PCA reduces two or more correlated variables into a single one. It is what happened with our set of inputs, outputs, and undesirable outputs, as seventeen variables were reduced to three that can explain more than 90% of the former ones' variability.

6.3. On modeling the imperfect knowledge of data

We consider the following subscenario to model the IKD: three quarters of the observations ($0.75 \times 108 \text{ DMUs} \times 3 \text{ variables} = 243$), randomly chosen, were replaced by sets to model IKD. These sets share the same geometry.

To define the sets Λ to model IKD, we started by noticing the existence of three variables: $\tilde{x} = PCA(x)$, $\tilde{y} = PCA(y)$, and $\tilde{u} = PCA(u)$, all with unitary standard deviation. The utilization of PCA exacerbates or propagates the problem of IKD, justifying (even more) the adoption of the integrated approach HR+DEA.

We consider the superellipsoid defined below to characterize the sets used to model IKD. The superellipsoid generalizes the hyper-boxes, hyper-ellipsoids, and the hyper-rhombuses (Lamé, 1818), as well as other geometric shapes. In our three-dimensional case (three variables after PCA), the set Λ , centered on the empirical observations $(\tilde{x}^{j(0)}, \tilde{y}^{j(0)}, \tilde{u}^{j(0)})$, $j \in J$, associated with the super-ellipsoid is as follows:

$$\Lambda^j = \left\{ (\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{u}) \in \mathbb{R}_+^3 \mid \left(\left| \frac{\tilde{x} - \tilde{x}^{j(0)}}{w_j^x} \right|^{O_1} + \left| \frac{\tilde{y} - \tilde{y}^{j(0)}}{w_j^y} \right|^{O_1} \right)^{\frac{O_2}{O_1}} + \left| \frac{\tilde{u} - \tilde{u}^{j(0)}}{w_j^u} \right|^{O_2} \leq 1 \right\}, \quad j \in J. \quad (6.1)$$

Following Gielis (2003), in terms of spherical coordinates, the points of the boundary of Λ in each HR iteration ℓ can be parametrically defined by:

$$\begin{cases} \hat{x}^{j(\ell)}(\psi^{(\ell)}, \phi^{(\ell)}) = \tilde{x}^{j(0)} + w_j^x g^{(1)}\left(\phi^{(\ell)}, \frac{2}{O_1}\right) g^{(1)}\left(\psi^{(\ell)}, \frac{2}{O_1}\right), \\ \hat{y}^{j(\ell)}(\psi^{(\ell)}, \phi^{(\ell)}) = \tilde{y}^{j(0)} + w_j^y g^{(1)}\left(\phi^{(\ell)}, \frac{2}{O_2}\right) g^{(2)}\left(\psi^{(\ell)}, \frac{2}{O_1}\right), \\ \hat{u}^{j(\ell)}(\psi^{(\ell)}, \phi^{(\ell)}) = \tilde{u}^{j(0)} + w_j^u g^{(2)}\left(\phi^{(\ell)}, \frac{2}{O_1}\right), \end{cases} \quad \ell = 1, \dots, t, \quad j \in J, \quad (6.2)$$

where $g^{(1)}(a, b) = \text{sgn}(\cos a) |\cos a|^b$, $g^{(2)}(a, b) = \text{sgn}(\sin a) |\sin a|^b$, $\psi^{(\ell)} \in [-\pi, \pi]$, and $\phi^{(\ell)} \in [-\pi/2, \pi/2]$.¹¹

Because of the parametric definition of the hit points, instead of generating a directional vector $d^{(\ell)}$ as usual in HR, we randomly select $\psi^{(\ell)} \sim \text{uniform}(-\pi, \pi)$ and $\phi^{(\ell)} \sim \text{uniform}(-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2})$. In fact, this is equivalent of drawing $d_j^{(\ell)}$ because $\nabla^{j(\ell)} = (\hat{x}^{j(\ell-1)} - \tilde{x}^{j(\ell-1)}, \hat{y}^{j(\ell-1)} - \tilde{y}^{j(\ell-1)}, \hat{u}^{j(\ell-1)} - \tilde{u}^{j(\ell-1)})$ and $d_j^{(\ell)} / \|d_j^{(\ell)}\|_2 = \nabla_j^{(\ell)} / \|\nabla_j^{(\ell)}\|_2$. Hence, $(\hat{x}^{j(\ell)}, \hat{y}^{j(\ell)}, \hat{u}^{j(\ell)}) = (\tilde{x}^{j(\ell-1)}, \tilde{y}^{j(\ell-1)}, \tilde{u}^{j(\ell-1)}) + \lambda_j^{(\ell)} \xi_j^{(\ell)} \nabla^{(\ell)j}$ is a random point within the super-ellipsoid defining the set Λ , following the HR procedure, being $\lambda_j^{(\ell)} = \|\nabla_j^{(\ell)}\|_2$, for any $\ell = 1, \dots, t$. Using spherical coordinates simplifies the HR algorithm but the parametric definition of coordinates are not easily obtained for situations with more than three dimensions (three variables). Presently, we selected parameters $w_j = (w_j^x, w_j^y, w_j^u) =$

¹¹ $\text{sgn}(a)$ denotes the sign function of a ; e.g., $\text{sgn}(-5)=-1$ and $\text{sgn}(2)=1$.

(0.2, 0.2, 0.2) to define the dimensions of each set.

We considered three different ways of modeling IKD in \mathbb{R}_+^3 , as presented in Table 6.1 and in Figure 7.1. For instance, it is possible to show that, for significantly high orders O_1 and O_2 (i.e., $O_1, O_2 \rightarrow +\infty$), we get an hyper-box with volume $w^x \cdot w^y \cdot w^z$ from Equations (6.1) and (6.2).

Table 6.1: Three subscenarios to model IKD.			
Scenario	Case	O_1	O_2
(a)	Hyper-box (Λ^{HB})	$+\infty$	$+\infty$
(b)	Hyper-ellipsoid (Λ^{HE})	2	2
(c)	Hyper-rhombus (Λ^{HR})	1	1

6.4. Results

Table 6.2 presents the distance and efficiency estimation using the integrated approach and considering the scenario (b) hyper-ellipsoid, and the years 2013 and 2014. Table B.3 (see Appendix B) presents the results of a similar exercise, this time regarding the years 2015 and 2016.¹² Also in Appendix B, and in the same vein, Tables B.1 to B.5 exhibit the results of the same analysis, for two distinct scenarios: (a) hyper-box, and (c) hyper-rhombus. In these tables, we provide the efficiency robustness interval index, $ERII_0^k$, of each DMU concerning the efficiency bucket, b_0 , as detailed in Definition 5.7 and Equation (5.22), to evaluate the probability of each DMU be efficient, i.e., $ERII_0^k = \Pr(D^k = 0)$. Such a chance is quite heterogeneous as the coefficient of variation is bigger than 150% for most of scenarios and years. About the expected value of this probability, we may verify that it was about 20% (regardless of the scenario adopted), decreasing to 4-10% in the following three years (2014-2016). It suggests that the frontier constructed using the entire sample is mostly composed of observations from 2013.

The expected value of the distance to the frontier presented in the tables mentioned before was estimated using the approximation in Equation (5.23), as described in Remark 5.7. In the present case, we divided the domain $[0, \max_\ell D^{j(\ell)}]$ into buckets of width 0.01, for all $j \in J = \{1, \dots, 108\}$. To complement this analysis, we constructed the 95% confidence intervals following Equation (5.24), and computed the empirical standard deviation, $\sqrt{\text{Var}(\Theta^k)}$, provided that $\text{Var}(\Theta^k) = \mathbb{E}((D^k)^2) - \mathbb{E}^2(D^k)$ by definition. Also, we took advantage of these constructs to estimate the expected value of efficiency, $\mathbb{E}(\Theta^k)$, using Equation (5.21). Finally, we classified the DMUs in four categories, C_1 (perfectly robust efficient) to C_4 (inefficient), following Definitions 5.9 to 5.12,

¹²Appendix available at: https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1jAmKFzz_PWyPKSNTxq0_0mM8BWKWn3-D?usp=sharing

and assuming $\tau = 0.95$.

In general, Portuguese public hospitals proved to be significantly and consistently inefficient across the period considered, a result of excessive resources consumption and high levels of undesirable outputs generated, given the level of desirable outputs delivered. To better understand it, we note that (in the absence of slacks) input targets are $(x_i^j)^* = x_i^k(1 - D^k)$, while the (desirable) output targets are $(y_r^j)^* = y_r^k(1 + D^k)$. Considering the scenario (a), on average, in 2013, the Portuguese public hospitals' consumption of inputs was 11.22% above the optimal values, in 2013. In other words, input targets were about 89% of the observed consumption profiles. In opposition, the target for the delivery of desirable outputs was 111.22% of the observed values in the same year. Consistently throughout the three scenarios, it seems that performance decreased from 2013 to 2015, watching a tenuous improvement in the last biennium considered.

These results are in line with the decrease of DMUs in category C_1 , with the corresponding increasing in C_4 . See Table 6.3 that shows the rate of hospitals per category, C_1 to C_4 , year, and scenario. From 2014 onward, the number of observations considered inefficient remained nearly steady, because the lower bounds of the 95% confidence intervals associated with D^k were consistently larger than zero. Nonetheless, it seems that there is some dependence of the results on the scenario; *e.g.*, 7% of our DMUs were perfectly robust efficient in 2016 in scenario (a), but none in that condition was observed in the same year in the other two scenarios. A plausible reason is because the domain of Λ^{HB} is less restricted than either Λ^{HE} or Λ^{HR} 's, for $w_j = (0.2, 0.2, 0.2)$. Besides, as shown in Table B.6 (in Appendix B), most observations, nearly 70%, did never switch from one category to another.

Table 6.2: Efficiency estimation using the Hit & Run approach and the scenario (b). Results for 2013 and 2014.

Hospital	2013						2014							
	$ERII_h^k$	$\mathbb{E}(D^k)$	$LB_{95\%}$	$UB_{95\%}$	$\sqrt{Var(D^k)}$	$\mathbb{E}(\Theta^k)$	Category	$ERII_h^k$	$\mathbb{E}(D^k)$	$LB_{95\%}$	$UB_{95\%}$	$\sqrt{Var(D^k)}$	$\mathbb{E}(\Theta^k)$	Category
1	0.00	0.2550	0.2425	0.2675	0.0066	0.5937	C_4	0.00	0.2916	0.2757	0.3089	0.0086	0.5485	C_4
2	0.27	0.1735	0.0000	0.3304	0.1171	0.7213	C_3	0.00	0.3253	0.2770	0.4084	0.0377	0.5103	C_4
3	0.00	0.0966	0.0936	0.0998	0.0017	0.8239	C_4	0.00	0.1775	0.1435	0.2108	0.0189	0.6989	C_4
4	0.00	0.0456	0.0358	0.0573	0.0059	0.9129	C_4	0.00	0.1047	0.0939	0.1163	0.0061	0.8105	C_4
5	0.00	0.2166	0.2100	0.2234	0.0036	0.6439	C_4	0.00	0.2541	0.2464	0.2620	0.0042	0.5948	C_4
6	1.00	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000	C_1	0.00	0.0428	0.0305	0.0552	0.0072	0.9180	C_4
7	0.00	0.1921	0.1847	0.2000	0.0041	0.6777	C_4	0.00	0.2339	0.2234	0.2452	0.0059	0.6209	C_4
8	0.57	0.0124	0.0000	0.0463	0.0161	0.9761	C_3	0.93	0.0102	0.0000	0.1432	0.0360	0.9824	C_3
9	0.00	0.1239	0.1185	0.1296	0.0030	0.7795	C_4	0.00	0.1621	0.1552	0.1695	0.0038	0.7210	C_4
10	0.00	0.1022	0.0862	0.1271	0.0096	0.8147	C_4	0.00	0.1213	0.0296	0.2412	0.0671	0.7900	C_4
11	0.00	0.0346	0.0238	0.0456	0.0063	0.9331	C_4	0.00	0.0664	0.0537	0.0792	0.0077	0.8755	C_4
12	1.00	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000	C_1	0.00	0.0636	0.0609	0.0666	0.0016	0.8803	C_4
13	0.00	0.0095	0.0084	0.0106	0.0006	0.9812	C_4	0.02	0.0353	0.0012	0.0692	0.0202	0.9325	C_4
14	0.00	0.0585	0.0455	0.0727	0.0074	0.8895	C_4	0.00	0.1715	0.1573	0.1860	0.0079	0.7072	C_4
15	0.00	0.2263	0.2167	0.2360	0.0053	0.6310	C_4	0.00	0.2650	0.2527	0.2774	0.0066	0.5811	C_4
16	0.00	0.0089	0.0026	0.0395	0.0100	0.9826	C_4	0.47	0.0341	0.0000	0.1498	0.0470	0.9381	C_3
17	1.00	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000	C_1	0.00	0.0452	0.0435	0.0469	0.0009	0.9134	C_4
18	0.00	0.1392	0.1343	0.1442	0.0027	0.7556	C_4	0.00	0.1541	0.1317	0.1760	0.0129	0.7332	C_4
19	0.00	0.2057	0.2001	0.2117	0.0032	0.6588	C_4	0.00	0.2168	0.2104	0.2236	0.0036	0.6437	C_4
20	0.00	0.0798	0.0726	0.0869	0.0041	0.8523	C_4	0.00	0.1339	0.1149	0.1525	0.0109	0.7640	C_4
21	0.00	0.1218	0.0914	0.1501	0.0178	0.7833	C_4	0.00	0.1857	0.1775	0.1943	0.0046	0.6867	C_4
22	0.97	0.0013	0.0000	0.0150	0.0086	0.9975	C_2	0.86	0.0021	0.0000	0.0246	0.0061	0.9959	C_3
23	0.00	0.2775	0.2634	0.2920	0.0076	0.5656	C_4	0.00	0.3161	0.2978	0.3330	0.0098	0.5197	C_4
24	0.00	0.1982	0.1877	0.2085	0.0055	0.6692	C_4	0.00	0.2231	0.2107	0.2353	0.0065	0.6353	C_4
25	0.00	0.0720	0.0668	0.0779	0.0030	0.8657	C_4	0.00	0.1445	0.1386	0.1504	0.0032	0.7475	C_4
26	0.00	0.1803	0.1556	0.2044	0.0142	0.6948	C_4	0.00	0.1909	0.1662	0.2137	0.0144	0.6797	C_4
27	0.84	0.0083	0.0000	0.0956	0.0238	0.9846	C_3	0.00	0.0144	0.0056	0.0895	0.0208	0.9725	C_4
Mean	0.2094	0.1052	0.0904	0.1249	0.0107	0.8218		0.0842	0.1476	0.1296	0.1788	0.0141	0.7556	
Std.Dev.	0.3783	0.0883	0.0866	0.0951	0.0216	0.1422		0.2455	0.0962	0.0960	0.0928	0.0154	0.1471	
CV	181%	84%	96%	76%	203%	17%		292%	65%	74%	52%	109%	19%	

Table 6.3: Rate of hospitals per category, year, and scenario.

Category	Scenario (a)				Scenario (b)				Scenario (c)			
	2013	2014	2015	2016	2013	2014	2015	2016	2013	2014	2015	2016
C_1	15%	4%	0%	7%	11%	0%	0%	7%	15%	4%	0%	0%
C_2	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
C_3	7%	0%	0%	4%	11%	11%	7%	4%	19%	11%	11%	11%
C_4	78%	96%	100%	89%	74%	89%	93%	89%	67%	85%	89%	89%

As mentioned before, there are suspicions that the model specifications might play a pivotal role on efficiency or distance estimation. A simple correlation analysis of the expected value of efficiency from the three scenarios states that all Pearson's correlation coefficients are above 0.92 and statistically significant. However, it only allows us to conclude that all scenarios tend to produce results in the same direction. It is not sufficient to conclude whether one model produces distinct outcomes or not, though. Table 6.4 compares the three scenarios using the p-value and Equation (5.29) with three distinct Hölder orders to estimate the statistic T^ℓ , $\ell = 1, \dots, t$: 1 (simple arithmetic mean of distances), 2 (root mean square), and ∞ (maximum). In this case, we are testing if the orders specified in Table 6.1 should impact in distance estimates (and efficiency, accordingly). If the p-value is larger than 5%, then we have no statistical evidence supporting the rejection of the null hypothesis of similar distributions. For instance, the p-value of the null hypothesis $H_0: D^j(\text{scenario (b)}) = D^j(\text{scenario (c)})$ for most $j \in J$ is 0.8900. Although assuming the common arithmetic mean to test such an hypothesis would never result in the latter's rejection, the results in this table suggest the possibility of concluding that there is evidence of efficiency dependence on the model specifications. Nonetheless, such a dependence is not yet well understood, being left for further research.

Table 6.4: Comparison of the three scenarios: p-values considering three orders for the Hölder mean - 1 (arithmetic mean), 2 (root mean square), and ∞ (maximum).

(i) Order 1				(ii) Order 2				(iii) Order ∞			
		(a)	(b)	(c)			(a)	(b)	(c)		
(a)	1	0.6920	0.6208		(a)	1	0.4844	0.5196		(a)	1
(b)			1	0.9512	(b)			1	0.8900	(b)	
(c)				1	(c)				1	(c)	

To exemplify the stochastic nature of our estimates and the usefulness of outputs from Subsection 5.4, we take a look at hospital 1, which corresponds to the DMUs 1, 28, 55, and 82, from 2013 to 2016. Regarding scenario (a), the distribution of distances was mostly composed of peaks, being impossible to detect an appropriate parametric function for the densities. In opposition, the distributions of those DMUs in scenarios (b) and (c) seem very well behaved, and we could approximate the empirical distribution by Beta distributions. Details

Table 6.5: Parameters and efficiency results associated with the Beta distributions exhibited in Figure 6.2 (hospital 1, *i.e.*, DMUs 1, 28, 55, and 82).

(i) Shape parameters, α and β					(ii) Efficiency results								
		Scenario (b)		Scenario (c)				Scenario (b)		Scenario (c)			
		α	β	α	β			ρ	σ	$\mathbb{E}(\Theta^k)$	ρ	σ	$\mathbb{E}(\Theta^k)$
2013	1,095.5	3,201.2	663.8	1,906.9	2013	0.2550	0.0066	0.5937	0.2582	0.0086	0.5896		
2014	807.4	1,961.5	939.3	2,264.2	2014	0.2916	0.0086	0.5485	0.2932	0.0080	0.5466		
2015	91.7	213.4	1,135.8	2,598.8	2015	0.3006	0.0262	0.5384	0.3041	0.0075	0.5336		
2016	821.6	2,196.5	890.4	2,365.7	2016	0.2722	0.0081	0.5721	0.2735	0.0078	0.5706		

about this distribution can be found in Examples 5.1 and 5.3. Figures B.4 and B.5 (Appendix B) provide the densities associated with the distance of hospital 1 to the frontier, as well as the best fit, which was always a Beta distribution. We used the MATLAB (R2018b) function 'fitmethis' and the log-likelihood criterion to select the parametric distribution function with the *best* goodness-of-fit.¹³ We tested the goodness-of-fit of the Beta distributions using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov non-parametric test and the p-values were always above 0.90. It means that the Beta distribution is appropriate to model the densities of the distance of hospital 1 to the efficiency frontier: $D^k \sim \text{Beta}(\alpha, \beta)$, $k = 1, 28, 55, 82$. We placed the four yearly distributions side-by-side in Figure 6.2, and the corresponding shape parameters, α and β , in Table 6.5(i).

As we can see, all those parameters α and β are substantially larger than 1. Thus, $(\alpha + 1)/(\alpha - 1) \approx 1$ and $(\beta + 1)/(\beta - 1) \approx 1$. According to the Remark 5.1, in that case, we can approximate any Beta distribution to a Gaussian, after a suitable change of parameters to ρ (location) and σ (scale); see Equation (5.8). Gaussian distributions are much more manageable than the Beta ones. Table 6.5(ii) provides these parameters and the expected value of efficiency. Efficiency results after applying the Equation (5.8) to estimate $\rho = \mathbb{E}(D^k)$ and $\sigma = \sqrt{\text{Var}(D^k)}$, and Equation (5.21) to estimate $\mathbb{E}(\Theta^k)$. Note the difference in $\mathbb{E}(\Theta^k)$ for $k = 82$ in scenario (b) and 2016 between Tables 6.5(ii) and 7.1. Although they have been estimated using the same Equation, the differences lie in parameters ρ and σ , which were estimated either directly from the 5,000 estimates or after their parameterization by a Beta (Gaussian) distribution.

As we can see in the densities representation, there was a significant shift to the right from 2013 to 2014, indicating a considerable efficiency worsening, followed by a smaller shift in the next biennium (2014-2015), suggesting a smoother worsening of efficiency compared to the previous downfall. Then, there was an improvement of efficiency, from 2015 to 2016; but the same hospital remained less efficient in 2016 than it was in 2013. The

¹³Francisco de Castro (2020). fitmethis available at <https://www.mathworks.com/matlabcentral/fileexchange/40167-fitmethis>, MATLAB Central File Exchange. Retrieved December 12, 2020.




Figure 6.2: Beta distributions (side-by-side) of the distance of hospital 1 (DMUs 1, 28, 55, and 82) to the frontier, per year (2013-2016), and concerning the scenarios (b) hyper-ellipsoid and (c) hyper-rhombus.

DMU j	DMU k	Scenario (b)	Scenario (c)
1 (2013)	28 (2014)	99.96%	99.85%
1 (2013)	55 (2015)	95.41%	100.00%
1 (2013)	82 (2016)	95.02%	90.48%
28 (2014)	55 (2015)	62.73%	83.92%
28 (2014)	82 (2016)	5.09%	3.90%
55 (2015)	82 (2016)	15.08%	0.23%

major difference between both plots is the variance of the distribution of DMU 55 (2015) in scenario (b), which can be clearly noticed by the results displayed in Table 6.5(ii). Besides, it is interesting these results with the probability of one DMU outperforming another. Table 6.6 highlights the cross-probabilities $\Pr(D^j \leq D^k)$ using the cumulative distribution function of the standard Gaussian distribution (see Example 5.4), a valid proxy for Beta distributions with large shape parameters. According to our results, it is very unlikely that DMU 1 (2013) could be outperformed by any other observation of the same hospital from 2014 onward. Indeed, the probability of this observation being outperformed is, at the most, 9.52%. In opposition, DMUs 28 (2014) and 55 (2015) are almost certainly outperformed by the others. These results seem to be consistent with the intersection of densities of distance, as shown in Figure 6.2.

Rather than the distance to the frontier, researchers are often more interested in the efficiency score. Since the distance D^k after the integrated approach becomes a stochastic variable, it is natural that Θ^k is also stochastic. Using either Equation (5.16) or (5.17) with the parameters in Table 6.5(i), we generated the points




Figure 6.3: GEV distributions (side-by-side) of the efficiency of hospital 1 (DMUs 1, 28, 55, and 82), per year (2013-2016), and concerning the scenarios (b) hyper-ellipsoid and (c) hyper-rhombus. Note: GEV stands for Generalized Extreme Value (distribution).

of the distribution, which were then adjusted by a known parametric density function. In the present case, the efficiency of hospital 1, regardless of the year and scenario, (b) or (c), is well modelled by Generalized Extreme Value (\mathcal{GEV}) distributions with parameters ρ (location), σ (scale), and ψ (shape): $\Theta^k \sim \mathcal{GEV}(\rho, \sigma, \psi)$, $k = 1, 28, 55, 82$. \mathcal{GEV} distributions maximized the log-likelihood criterion among the parametric families of densities. Figure 6.3 exhibits the densities per year, side-by-side. The behaviour of efficiency as a stochastic variable is consistent with the analysis of Figure 6.2. Table 6.7 contains the parameters of the \mathcal{GEV} distributions. The expected value of efficiency results from $\mathbb{E}(\Theta^k) = \rho + \sigma(g_1 - 1)/\psi$ for $g_1 = \Gamma(1 - \psi)$, since $\psi < 0$. Likewise, $Var(\Theta^k) = \sigma^2(g_2 - g_1^2)/\psi^2$ for $g_2 = \Gamma(1 - 2\psi)$. Note that the maximum difference between the expected values between Tables 6.5(ii) and 6.7 is 0.0002, thus meaningless. It is worth of mentioning that any \mathcal{GEV} distribution with negative shape parameter, $\psi < 0$, belongs to the Weibull family of densities (\mathcal{GEV} distributions type III; see Bali (2003)). More precisely, the stochastic variable Θ^k , $k = 1, 28, 55, 82$, follows reverse Weibull distributions. Interestingly, Park et al. (1999), Cazals et al. (2002), and Daouia and Simar (2005, 2007) have concluded that efficiency asymptotically tends to follow Weibull distributions. We leave for further research investigating whether this trend is observed for the remaining DMUs in our sample and in more general cases.

Table 6.7: Parameters of the GEV distributions describing the density of efficiency of hospital 1 (DMUs 1, 28, 55, and 82), for scenarios (b) hyper-ellipsoid and (c) hyper-rhombus.

		Scenario (b)				Scenario (c)			
		2013	2014	2015	2016	2013	2014	2015	2016
Location	ρ	0.5909	0.5453	0.5330	0.5689	0.5869	0.5439	0.5310	0.5679
Scale	σ	0.0085	0.0106	0.0350	0.0102	0.0118	0.0102	0.0093	0.0102
Shape	ψ	-0.3344	-0.3564	-0.6350	-0.3395	-0.4860	-0.4339	-0.4030	-0.4468
$g_1 = \Gamma(1 - \psi)$		0.8929	0.8905	0.8979	0.8923	0.8859	0.8859	0.8871	0.8857
$g_2 = \Gamma(1 - 2\psi)$		0.9031	0.9111	1.1462	0.9048	0.9885	0.9511	0.9330	0.9596
$\mathbb{E}(\Theta^k)$		0.5936	0.5486	0.5386	0.5721	0.5897	0.5466	0.5336	0.5705
$Var(\Theta^k)$		0.0001	0.0001	0.0010	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001
$\sqrt{Var(\Theta^k)}$		0.0083	0.0102	0.0321	0.0099	0.0110	0.0096	0.0088	0.0096

7. Concluding remarks and future research directions

Our paper proposes the application of a HR procedure to DEA to introduce a stochastic nature into the latter. The deterministic nature of DEA is commonly pointed out as one of its main shortcomings. This way, we introduce the possibility of making statistical inference with efficiency estimates at the same time that we account for IKD, which is a problem plaguing most of databases. The proposed procedure generalizes the interval DEA, which provides the broadest confidence intervals for efficiency when IKD is modeled using intervals. The integrated approach HR+DEA has a superior performance comparatively with some widely spread alternatives such as regressions. Unless we know precisely the mathematical function underlying the production process, using a predefined function to fit and estimate these IKD (typically gaps) is only a matter of *shooting in the dark*. Besides, the stochastic nature of efficiency scores obtained through the integrated approach is its greatest advantage. The model is simple to implement and allows the researcher/expert/decision-maker to bound imperfect knowledge directly on data, making her/his job easier in most of the empirical situations.

In the near future we expect to test our integrated approach for robustness in terms of the quantity (or rate) of observations to account for IKD, the size or dimensions of each set (as defined by the parameters w), and other shapes for sets Λ (namely, the possibility of including non-convex sets).

Acknowledgements

This work was financially supported by the hSNS FCT – Research Project (02/SAICT/2017/30546). José Rui Figueira also acknowledges the support from the FCT grant SFRH/BSAB/139892/2018 under POCH Program during his stay at the Department of Mathematics of the University of Wuppertal, Germany.

References

- Andel, C., Davidow, S., Hollander, M., Moreno, D., 2012. The economics of health care quality and medical errors. *Journal of Health Care Finance* 39, 39 – 50.
- Artzner, P., Delbaen, F., Jean-Marc, E., Heath, D.D., 1999. Coherent measures of risk. *Mathematical Finance* 9, 203–228.
- Bali, T.G., 2003. The generalized extreme value distribution. *Economics Letters* 79, 423 – 427.
- Banker, R., 1984. Estimating most productive scale size using data envelopment analysis. *European Journal of Operational Research* 17, 35–44.
- Banker, R.D., 1993. Maximum likelihood, consistency and data envelopment analysis: A statistical foundation. *Management Science* 39, 1265–1273.
- Bélisle, C., Romeijn, H., Smith, R., 1993. Hit-and-run algorithms for generating multivariate distributions. *Mathematics of Operations Research* 19, 255–266.
- Ben-Tal, A., Nemirovski, A., 1998. Robust convex optimization. *Mathematics of Operations Research* 23, 769–805.
- Ben-Tal, A., Nemirovski, A., 2000. Robust solutions of linear programming problems contaminated with uncertain data. *Mathematical Programming* 88, 411–424.
- Bertsimas, D., Brown, D.B., 2009. Constructing uncertainty sets for robust linear optimization. *Operations Research* 57, 1483–1495.
- Bertsimas, D., Gupta, V., Kallus, N., 2018. Data-driven robust optimization. *Mathematical Programming* 167, 235–292.
- Bertsimas, D., Sim, M., 2004. The price of robustness. *Operations Research* 52, 35–53.
- Braspenning, J., Hermens, R., Calsbeek, H., Campbell, S., van der Wees, P., Grol, R., 2020. Indicators for Quality and Safety of Care. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. chapter 7. pp. 131–154.
- Cabrera, E., Estruch-Juan, E., Molinos-Senante, M., 2018. Adequacy of dea as a regulatory tool in the water sector. the impact of data uncertainty. *Environmental Science & Policy* 85, 155 – 162.
- Campos, L., 2001. On some solutions of the extended confluent hypergeometric differential equation. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics* 137, 177 – 200.
- Cazals, C., Florens, J., L., S., 2002. Nonparametric frontier estimation: A robust approach. *Journal of Econometrics* 106, 1–25.
- Chambers, R., Chung, Y., Färe, R., 1996. Benefit and distance functions. *Journal of Economic Theory* 70, 407–419.
- Chambers, R., Chung, Y., Färe, R., 1998. Profit, directional distance functions, and nerlovian efficiency. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications* 98, 351–364.

- Chang, J., Zhang, L., 2019. Case mix index weighted multi-objective optimization of inpatient bed allocation in general hospital. *Journal of Combinatorial Optimization* 37, 1–19.
- Charnes, A., Cooper, W., Rhodes, E., 1979. Measuring the efficiency of decision-making units. *European Journal of Operational Research* 3, 201–209.
- Classen, D.C., Resar, R., Griffin, F., Federico, F., Frankel, T., Kimmel, N., Whittington, J.C., Frankel, A., Seger, A., James, B.C., 2011. ‘global trigger tool’ shows that adverse events in hospitals may be ten times greater than previously measured. *Health Affairs* 30, 581–589.
- Cooper, W., Seiford, L., Tone, K., 2007. *Data Envelopment Analysis: A Comprehensive Text with Models, Applications, References and DEA-solver Software*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Boston, US.
- Cooper, W.W., Park, K.S., Yu, G., 1999. Idea and ar-idea: Models for dealing with imprecise data in dea. *Management Science* 45, 597–607.
- Cordero, J., Prior, D., Simancas, R., 2016. A comparison of public and private schools in Spain using robust nonparametric frontier methods. *Central European Journal of Operations Research* 24, 659–680.
- Curtiss, J.H., 1941. On the distribution of the quotient of two chance variables. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 12, 409–421.
- Daouia, A., Simar, L., 2005. Robust nonparametric estimators of monotone boundaries. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* 96, 311–331.
- Daouia, A., Simar, L., 2007. Nonparametric efficiency analysis: A multivariate conditional quantile approach. *Journal of Econometrics* 140, 375–400.
- Daraio, C., Simar, L., 2007. *Advanced Robust and Nonparametric Methods in Efficiency Analysis*. Springer Science + Business Media, Inc., New York, USA.
- Despotis, D., Smirlis, Y., 2002. Data envelopment analysis with imprecise data. *European Journal of Operational Research* 140, 24 – 36.
- Ehrgott, M., Holder, A., Nohadani, O., 2018. Uncertain data envelopment analysis. *European Journal of Operational Research* 268, 231–242.
- Emrouznejad, A., Tavana, M., 2014. *Performance Measurement with Fuzzy Data Envelopment Analysis*. Springer Science + Business Media, Inc., New York, USA.
- Entani, T., Maeda, Y., Tanaka, H., 2002. Dual models of interval dea and its extension to interval data. *European Journal of Operational Research* 136, 32 – 45.
- Ferreira, D., Marques, R., 2015. Did the corporatization of Portuguese hospitals significantly change their productivity? *The European Journal of Health Economics* 16, 289–303.
- Ferreira, D., Marques, R., 2016. Malmquist and Hicks-Moorsteen productivity indexes for clusters performance evaluation. *International Journal of Information Technology & Decision Making* 15, 1015–1053.
- Ferreira, D., Marques, R., 2018. Do quality and access to hospital services impact on their technical efficiency? *Omega: The International Journal of Operational Research* doi: 10.1016/j.omega.2018.07.010.
- Ferreira, D., Marques, R., Nunes, A., 2017. Economies of scope in the health sector: The case of Portuguese hospitals. *European Journal of Operational Research* doi: 10.1016/j.ejor.2017.09.044.

- Ferreira, D., Nunes, A., Marques, R., 2018. Doctors, nurses, and the optimal scale size in the Portuguese public hospitals. *Health Policy* 122, 1093–1100.
- Ferreira, D., Nunes, A., Marques, R., 2020a. Operational efficiency vs clinical safety, care appropriateness, timeliness, and access to health care. *Journal of Productivity Analysis* 53, 355–375.
- Ferreira, D.C., Nunes, A.M., Marques, R.C., 2020b. Optimizing payments based on efficiency, quality, complexity, and heterogeneity: the case of hospital funding. *International Transactions in Operational Research* 27, 1930–1961.
- Ferrera, C., Cebada, E., Zamorano, L., 2013. The effect of quality and socio-demographic variables on efficiency measures in primary health care. *The European Journal of Health Economics* 15, 289–302.
- Fieller, E.C., 1932. The distribution of the index in a normal bivariate population. *Biometrika* 24, 428–440.
- French, S., 1995. Uncertainty and imprecision: Modelling and analysis. *Journal of the Operational Research Society* 46, 70–79.
- Fukuyama, H., Weber, W., 2017. Directional distance DEA models, in: Tone, K. (Ed.), *Advances in DEA Theory and Applications: With Extensions to Forecasting Models*. John Wiley & Sons Ltd. chapter 3, pp. 20–29.
- Gielis, J., 2003. A generic geometric transformation that unifies a wide range of natural and abstract shapes. *American Journal of Botany* 90, 333–338.
- Gregory, C., Darby-Dowman, K., Mitra, G., 2011. Robust optimization and portfolio selection: The cost of robustness. *European Journal of Operational Research* 212, 417 – 428.
- Hayek, F.A., 1945. The use of knowledge in society. *The American Economic Review* 35, 519–530.
- Hollingsworth, B., Peacock, S., 2008. *Efficiency Measurement in Health and Health Care*. Routledge, New York, USA.
- Kadziński, M., Labijak, A., Napieraj, M., 2017. Integrated framework for robustness analysis using ratio-based efficiency model with application to evaluation of Polish airports. *Omega: The International Journal of Operational Research* 67, 1–18.
- Kao, C., Liu, S., 2007. Data envelopment analysis with missing data: A reliable solution method, in: Zhu, J., Cook, W. (Eds.), *Modeling Data Irregularities and Structural Complexities in Data Envelopment Analysis*. Springer Science + Business Media, Inc., New York, USA, pp. 291–304.
- Kaufman, D., Smith, R., 1998. Direction choice for accelerated convergence in Hit-and-Run sampling. *Operations Research* 46, 84–95.
- Kuosmanen, T., 2005. Weak disposability in nonparametric production analysis with undesirable outputs. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 87, 1077–1082.
- Kuosmanen, T., 2009. Data envelopment analysis with missing data. *Journal of the Operational Research Society* 60, 1767–1774.
- Kuosmanen, T., Podinovski, V., 2009. Weak disposability in nonparametric production analysis: Reply to Färe and Grosskopf. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 91, 539–545.
- Lahdelma, R., Salminen, P., 2006. Stochastic multicriteria acceptability analysis using the data envelopment model. *European Journal of Operational Research* 170, 241 – 252.

- Lamé, G., 1818. Examen des Différentes Méthodes Employées pour Résoudre les Problèmes de Géométrie. Mme Ve Courcier, Paris, France.
- Lio, W., Liu, B., 2018. Uncertain data envelopment analysis with imprecisely observed inputs and outputs. *Fuzzy Optimization and Decision Making* 17, 357–373.
- McCradden, M.D., Joshi, S., Anderson, J.A., Mazwi, M., Goldenberg, A., Zlotnik Shaul, R., 2020. Patient safety and quality improvement: Ethical principles for a regulatory approach to bias in healthcare machine learning. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association* .
- McRae, S., Brunner, J.O., 2020. Assessing the impact of uncertainty and the level of aggregation in case mix planning. *Omega* 97, 102086.
- Nadarajah, S., 2006. Sums, products and ratios of generalized beta variables. *Statistical Papers* 47, 69–90.
- Olesen, O.B., 2006. Comparing and combining two approaches for chance constrained dea. *Journal of Productivity Analysis* 26, 103 – 119.
- Olesen, O.B., Petersen, N.C., 2016. Stochastic data envelopment analysis—a review. *European Journal of Operational Research* 251, 2 – 21.
- Olesen, O.B., Petersen, N.C., Podinovski, V.V., 2017. Efficiency measures and computational approaches for data envelopment analysis models with ratio inputs and outputs. *European Journal of Operational Research* 261, 640 – 655.
- Olinsky, A., Chen, S., Harlow, L., 2003. The comparative efficacy of imputation methods for missing data in structural equation modeling. *European Journal of Operational Research* 151, 53–79.
- Park, B., Simar, L., Weiner, C., 1999. The FDH estimator for productivity efficiency scores: Asymptotic properties. *Econometric Theory* 16, 855–877.
- Park, K.S., 2010. Duality, efficiency computations and interpretations in imprecise dea. *European Journal of Operational Research* 200, 289 – 296.
- Peizer, D.B., Pratt, J.W., 1968. A normal approximation for binomial, f, beta, and other common, related tail probabilities, i. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 63, 1416–1456.
- Pereira, M.A., Figueira, J.R., Marques, R.C., 2020. Using a choquet integral-based approach for incorporating decision-maker’s preference judgments in a data envelopment analysis model. *European Journal of Operational Research* 284, 1016 – 1030.
- Pham-Gia, T., Turkkan, N., Marchand, E., 2006. Density of the ratio of two normal random variables and applications. *Communications in Statistics - Theory and Methods* 35, 1569–1591.
- Portela, M., Thanassoulis, E., 2006. Malmquist indexes using a geometric distance function (GDF): Application to a sample of Portuguese bank branches. *Journal of Productivity Analysis* 25, 25–41.
- Raaijmakers, Q.A.W., 1999. Effectiveness of different missing data treatments in surveys with likert-type data: Introducing the relative mean substitution approach. *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 59, 725–748.
- Ramanathan, K., Antognini, D., Combes, A., Paden, M., Zakhary, B., Ogino, M., MacLaren, G., Brodie, D., Shekar, K., 2020. Planning and provision of ecmo services for severe ards during the covid-19 pandemic and other outbreaks of emerging infectious diseases. *The Lancet Respiratory Medicine* 8, 518–526.

- Reilly, M., 1993. Data analysis using hot deck multiple imputation. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series D* 42, 307–313.
- Rothschild, J.M., Hurley, A.C., Landrigan, C.P., Cronin, J.W., Martell-Waldrop, K., Foskett, C., Burdick, E., Czeisler, C.A., Bates, D.W., 2006. Recovery from medical errors: The critical care nursing safety net. *The Joint Commission Journal on Quality and Patient Safety* 32, 63 – 72.
- Roy, B., Figueira, J., Almeida-Dias, J., 2014. Discriminating thresholds as a tool to cope with imperfect knowledge in multiple criteria decision aiding: Theoretical results and practical issues. *Omega: The International Journal of Management Science* 43, 9–20.
- Salahi, M., Torabi, N., Amiri, A., 2016. An optimistic robust optimization approach to common set of weights in dea. *Measurement* 93, 67 – 73.
- Schwartz, L., 1950. *Theorie Des Distributions*, Vol. 1. Hermann.
- Schwartz, L., 1951. *Theorie Des Distributions*, Vol. 2. Hermann.
- Sengupta, J.K., 1992. A fuzzy systems approach in data envelopment analysis. *Computers & Mathematics with Applications* 24, 259 – 266.
- Shokouhi, A.H., Hatami-Marbini, A., Tavana, M., Saati, S., 2010. A robust optimization approach for imprecise data envelopment analysis. *Computers & Industrial Engineering* 59, 387 – 397.
- Smirlis, Y., Maragos, E., Despotis, D., 2006. Data envelopment analysis with missing values: An interval DEA approach. *Applied Mathematics and Computation* 177, 1 – 10.
- Smith, R., 1984. Efficient monte carlo procedures for generating points uniformly distributed over bounded regions. *Operations Research* 32, 1296–1308.
- Soleimani-damaneh, M., Jahanshahloo, G., Abbasbandy, S., 2006. Computational and theoretical pitfalls in some current performance measurement techniques; and a new approach. *Applied Mathematics and Computation* 181, 1199 – 1207.
- Soyster, A.L., 1973. Technical note—convex programming with set-inclusive constraints and applications to inexact linear programming. *Operations Research* 21, 1154–1157.
- Stuart, A., Ord, J., 2010. *Kendall’s Advanced Theory of Statistics, Volume 1, Distribution Theory*, 6th Edition. Wiley.
- Tervonen, T., Figueira, J., 2008. A survey on stochastic multicriteria acceptability analysis methods. *Journal of Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis* 15, 1–14.
- Tervonen, T., Lahdelma, R., 2007. Implementing stochastic multicriteria acceptability analysis. *European Journal of Operational Research* 178, 500–513.
- Umscheid, C.A., Mitchell, M.D., Doshi, J.A., Agarwal, R., Williams, K., Brennan, P.J., 2011. Estimating the proportion of healthcare-associated infections that are reasonably preventable and the related mortality and costs. *Infection Control & Hospital Epidemiology* 32, 101–114.
- Wei, G., Wang, J., 2017. A comparative study of robust efficiency analysis and data envelopment analysis with imprecise data. *Expert Systems with Applications* 81, 28 – 38.
- Wen, M., 2015. *Uncertain Data Envelopment Analysis*. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg.

- Witte, K.D., Marques, R., 2010. Influential observations in frontier models, a robust non-oriented approach to the water sector. *Annals of Operations Research* 181, 377–392.
- Wu, D., 2009. Performance evaluation: An integrated method using data envelopment analysis and fuzzy preference relations. *European Journal of Operational Research* 194, 227–235.
- Yang, F., Ang, S., Xia, Q., Yang, C., 2012. Ranking DMUs by using interval dea cross efficiency matrix with acceptability analysis. *European Journal of Operational Research* 223, 483 – 488.
- Zanella, A., Camanho, A., Dias, T., 2015. Undesirable outputs and weighting schemes in composite indicators based on data envelopment analysis. *European Journal of Operational Research* 245, 517 – 530.
- Zha, Y., Song, A., Xu, C., Yang, H., 2013. Dealing with missing data based on data envelopment analysis and halo effect. *Applied Mathematical Modelling* 37, 6135 – 6145.
- Zhu, J., 2003. Imprecise data envelopment analysis (idea): A review and improvement with an application. *European Journal of Operational Research* 144, 513 – 529.




Figure 7.1: Three different ways of modeling IKD using super-ellipsoids centered in $(5,5,5)$ and with semi-axes $(3,2,4)$: $\left(\left|\frac{x_1-5}{3}\right|^{O_1} + \left|\frac{x_2-5}{2}\right|^{O_1}\right)^{O_2/O_1} + \left|\frac{u_1-5}{4}\right|^{O_2} = 1$ (with 5,000 iterations).

Table 7.1: Efficiency estimation using the Hit & Run approach and the scenario (b). Results for 2015 and 2016.

Hospital	2015							2016						
	$ERII_0^k$	$\mathbb{E}(D^k)$	$LB_{95\%}$	$UB_{95\%}$	$\sqrt{Var(D^k)}$	$\mathbb{E}(\Theta^k)$	Category	$ERII_0^k$	$\mathbb{E}(D^k)$	$LB_{95\%}$	$UB_{95\%}$	$\sqrt{Var(D^k)}$	$\mathbb{E}(\Theta^k)$	Category
1	0.00	0.3005	0.2623	0.3531	0.0264	0.5385	C_4	0.00	0.2722	0.2572	0.2880	0.0081	0.5721	C_4
2	0.00	0.3208	0.2517	0.4134	0.0476	0.5162	C_4	0.00	0.3054	0.2680	0.3354	0.0169	0.5324	C_4
3	0.00	0.1538	0.1487	0.1590	0.0029	0.7335	C_4	0.00	0.1952	0.1577	0.2328	0.0209	0.6738	C_4
4	0.00	0.0727	0.0604	0.0839	0.0064	0.8645	C_4	0.00	0.0725	0.0614	0.0825	0.0057	0.8649	C_4
5	0.00	0.2612	0.2534	0.2691	0.0043	0.5858	C_4	0.00	0.2594	0.2517	0.2673	0.0042	0.5881	C_4
6	0.00	0.0487	0.0336	0.0657	0.0086	0.9072	C_4	0.00	0.0441	0.0310	0.0584	0.0075	0.9157	C_4
7	0.00	0.2464	0.2350	0.2585	0.0064	0.6046	C_4	0.00	0.2845	0.2422	0.3297	0.0250	0.5576	C_4
8	0.00	0.2253	0.2157	0.2364	0.0056	0.6322	C_4	0.00	0.2528	0.2372	0.2680	0.0090	0.5965	C_4
9	0.00	0.1604	0.1187	0.2013	0.0232	0.7242	C_4	0.00	0.1855	0.1773	0.1938	0.0045	0.6871	C_4
10	0.62	0.0501	0.0000	0.1982	0.0731	0.9138	C_3	0.62	0.2409	0.2297	0.2521	0.0059	0.6118	C_4
11	0.00	0.0641	0.0510	0.0773	0.0080	0.8796	C_4	0.00	0.0671	0.0535	0.0808	0.0083	0.8743	C_4
12	0.00	0.0668	0.0627	0.0712	0.0023	0.8747	C_4	0.00	0.0536	0.0521	0.0550	0.0008	0.8982	C_4
13	0.00	0.0180	0.0172	0.0188	0.0004	0.9646	C_4	0.00	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000	C_1
14	0.00	0.2037	0.1899	0.2173	0.0076	0.6616	C_4	0.00	0.1995	0.1885	0.2094	0.0057	0.6673	C_4
15	0.00	0.2473	0.2349	0.2595	0.0065	0.6035	C_4	0.00	0.2462	0.2341	0.2584	0.0064	0.6049	C_4
16	0.54	0.0129	0.0000	0.0613	0.0188	0.9753	C_3	0.54	0.0162	0.0000	0.0702	0.0221	0.9691	C_3
17	0.00	0.0571	0.0550	0.0593	0.0012	0.8919	C_4	0.00	0.0748	0.0719	0.0776	0.0015	0.8609	C_4
18	0.00	0.1670	0.1618	0.1723	0.0028	0.7139	C_4	0.00	0.1890	0.1836	0.1946	0.0030	0.6821	C_4
19	0.00	0.2018	0.1958	0.2082	0.0034	0.6641	C_4	0.00	0.1885	0.1827	0.1944	0.0032	0.6829	C_4
20	0.00	0.1192	0.1000	0.1387	0.0114	0.7872	C_4	0.00	0.1353	0.1153	0.1550	0.0115	0.7619	C_4
21	0.00	0.1558	0.1491	0.1628	0.0037	0.7304	C_4	0.00	0.1701	0.1628	0.1777	0.0041	0.7093	C_4
22	0.00	0.0214	0.0146	0.0541	0.0102	0.9582	C_4	0.00	0.0470	0.0349	0.0895	0.0147	0.9107	C_4
23	0.00	0.2786	0.2440	0.3070	0.0175	0.5645	C_4	0.00	0.2753	0.2056	0.3597	0.0476	0.5704	C_4
24	0.00	0.1968	0.1858	0.2076	0.0058	0.6712	C_4	0.00	0.2074	0.1594	0.2601	0.0292	0.6574	C_4
25	0.00	0.0787	0.0730	0.0851	0.0033	0.8542	C_4	0.00	0.0735	0.0697	0.0778	0.0022	0.8631	C_4
26	0.00	0.1958	0.1869	0.2054	0.0050	0.6725	C_4	0.00	0.2136	0.2058	0.2221	0.0044	0.6480	C_4
27	0.00	0.0183	0.0089	0.0989	0.0208	0.9649	C_4	0.00	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000	C_1
Mean	0.0431	0.1461	0.1300	0.1720	0.0123	0.7575		0.0431	0.1581	0.1420	0.1774	0.0101	0.7393	
Std.Dev.	0.1529	0.0943	0.0893	0.0981	0.0156	0.1442		0.1529	0.0955	0.0882	0.1029	0.0107	0.1470	
CV	354%	65%	69%	57%	126%	19%		354%	60%	62%	58%	106%	20%	