

# On the multi-stage shortest path problem under distributional uncertainty

Sergey S. Ketkov<sup>†a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Laboratory of Algorithms and Technologies for Networks Analysis, HSE University,  
Rodionova st., 136, Nizhny Novgorod, 603093, Russia*

---

## Abstract

In this paper we consider an ambiguity-averse multi-stage network game between a *user* and an *attacker*. The arc costs are assumed to be random variables that satisfy prescribed first-order moment constraints for some subsets of arcs and individual probability constraints for some particular arcs. The user aims at minimizing its cumulative expected loss by traversing between two fixed nodes in the network, while the attacker maximizes the user's objective function by selecting a distribution of arc costs from the family of admissible distributions. In contrast to most of the previous studies in the related literature, both the user and the attacker can dynamically adjust their decisions at each node of the user's path. By observing the user's decisions, the attacker needs to reveal some additional distributional information associated with the arcs emanated from the current user's position. It is shown that the resulting multi-stage distributionally robust shortest path problem admits a linear mixed-integer programming reformulation (MIP). In particular, we distinguish between acyclic and general graphs by introducing different forms of non-anticipativity constraints. Finally, we perform a numerical study, where the quality of adaptive decisions and computational tractability of the proposed MIP reformulation are explored with respect to several classes of synthetic network instances.

*Keywords:* shortest path problem; distributionally robust optimization; polyhedral uncertainty; piecewise constant decision rules; mixed-integer programming

---

## 1. Introduction

*Distributionally robust optimization* (DRO) is a methodology for addressing uncertainty in optimization problems, where the distribution of uncertain parameters is only known to reside within an *ambiguity set* (or a *family*) of admissible distributions; see, e.g., the studies in [6, 14, 17, 18, 38]. In this setting the decision-maker aims at minimizing its expected loss (or some measure of risk, if the decision-maker is risk-averse) under the worst-case possible distribution of uncertain parameters. For example, a standard *risk-neutral one-stage* DRO

---

<sup>†</sup>Corresponding author. Email: sketkov@hse.ru; phone: +7-910-382-2732.

problem can be expressed as:

$$\min_{\mathbf{y} \in Y} \max_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}} \{ \ell(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{y}) \}, \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathbf{c}$  is a vector of uncertain parameters,  $\mathbf{y} \in Y$  represents a vector of *here-and-now* decisions implemented before the realization of uncertainty and  $\ell(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{y})$  is a given loss function. The expectation is taken with respect to a distribution  $\mathbb{Q}$  of vector  $\mathbf{c}$ , which is only known to belong to some ambiguity set  $\mathcal{Q}$ .

Most recent solution approaches for single-stage problems rely on the duality results for moments problems due to Isii [24] and Shapiro [35]. That is, under some assumptions on the geometry of  $\mathcal{Q}$  and the functional properties of the loss function  $\ell(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{y})$ , the min-max problem in (1) can be recast as a single-level minimization problem; see, e.g., [14, 17, 38].

It has been also shown that distributionally robust optimization may address dynamic (or, equivalently, multi-stage) optimization problems, where decisions adapt to the uncertain outcomes as they unfold in stages; see, e.g., [6, 18, 21, 25]. In general, multi-stage DRO problems are computationally intractable [16, 35] since the *recourse decisions* (i.e., the decisions affected by uncertainty) can be modeled as arbitrary functions of the uncertain parameters. In this regard, there exist two basic approaches to handle multi-stage optimization problems. On the one hand, several studies propose approximations of the outlined problems, in which the recourse decisions are restricted to be some simple functions of the uncertain parameters [6, 18]. On the other hand, a number of studies focus on dynamic programming based solution procedures assuming that the uncertain parameters are stage-wise independent [15, 23].

In this study we focus on a class of multi-stage distributionally robust shortest path problems (DRSPP), where the vector of arc costs is subject to distributional uncertainty. From the game theoretical perspective, we consider a *dynamic zero-sum game* between two decision-makers, which are referred to as a *user* and an *attacker*. The user attempts to minimize its expected loss by traversing between two fixed nodes in a given network. At the same time, the attacker aims at maximizing the user's expected loss by selecting a distribution of arc costs within a given family of probability distributions. However, in contrast to the one-stage model, both the user and the attacker are able to adapt their decisions at each node of the user's path.

In fact, our multi-stage formulation is motivated and built upon the related one-stage formulation of DRSPP in [27]. Specifically, we preserve the same form of ambiguity set and the loss function, but introduce some *auxiliary distributional constraints* that can be verified by the user dynamically while traversing through the network.

### 1.1. Links to the one-stage model and our research questions

In this section we briefly describe our construction of the ambiguity set  $\mathcal{Q}$  (and thereby reiterate some basic ideas developed in our previous study [27]). Also, we formulate some research questions that need to be addressed when the problem unfolds in stages.

Let  $G := (N, A, \mathbf{c})$  be a directed weighted connected graph, in which  $N$  is a set of nodes,  $A$  is a set of directed arcs and  $\mathbf{c} = \{c_a, a \in A\}$  is a nonnegative cost vector. In the sequel, a person who traverses between some source and destination nodes in  $G$  is referred to as a *user*. On the other hand, we use a term *attacker* to specify a person who controls a distribution of the cost vector  $\mathbf{c}$ . Thus, the decision variables,  $\mathbf{y}$ , and the uncertain parameters,  $\mathbf{c}$ , in our model are given, respectively, by the incidence vector of a path selected by the user and the vector of arc costs.

We assume that the user has the following partial information about the distribution  $\mathbb{Q}$  of the cost vector  $\mathbf{c}$ . First, the costs of particular arcs  $a \in A$  are subject to *individual probability constraints* of the form:

$$\mathbb{Q}\{c_a \in [l_a^{(j)}, u_a^{(j)}]\} \in [\underline{q}_a^{(j)}, \bar{q}_a^{(j)}] \quad \forall j \in \mathcal{D}_a, a \in A, \quad (2)$$

where  $[l_a^{(j)}, u_a^{(j)}] \subseteq [l_a, u_a]$ ,  $j \in \mathcal{D}_a = \{1, \dots, d_a\}$ , is a finite set of subintervals;  $\underline{q}_a^{(j)}$  and  $\bar{q}_a^{(j)}$  are contained in  $[0, 1]$  and bound the probability that the random cost  $c_a$  belongs to the  $i$ -th subinterval. In particular, we assume that for each  $a \in A$  and  $j = 1$  the constraints

$$\mathbb{Q}\{c_a \in [l_a^{(j)}, u_a^{(j)}]\} \in [\underline{q}_a^{(j)}, \bar{q}_a^{(j)}]$$

are support constraints with  $l_a^{(j)} = l_a$ ,  $u_a^{(j)} = u_a$  and  $\underline{q}_a^{(j)} = \bar{q}_a^{(j)} = 1$  for some  $l_a, u_a \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \cup \{0\}$ .

Finally, for a real-valued matrix  $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{|A| \times k}$  and a vector  $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^k$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ , we introduce *linear expectation constraints* of the form:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\{\mathbf{B}\mathbf{c}\} \leq \mathbf{b} \quad (3)$$

Then the ambiguity set  $\mathcal{Q}$  is formed by all distributions that satisfy constraints (2) and (3).

It is well-known that many types of ambiguity sets can be constructed from independent observations of uncertain parameters. However, we argue that in contrast to the moment-based ambiguity sets [14] or ambiguity sets based on a distance metric from the empirical distribution [3, 17], our distributional constraints allow incomplete knowledge of the training data set. Formally, both constraints (2) and (3) can be constructed by using standard measure concentration inequalities for the empirical estimators of the frequency and the mean in the left hand side of (2) and (3), respectively. In particular, the probability that  $c_a \in [l'_a, u'_a]$  for some  $l'_a \leq u'_a$  can be estimated by using only the *number* of random samples that belong to the interval  $[l'_a, u'_a]$ . That is, the random samples with respect to particular arcs may be known up to some lower and upper limits. Furthermore, estimation of the mean in (3) requires only linear combinations of the arc costs with respect to some subsets of arcs; we refer the reader to Section 2.2 in [27] and Section 2.3 in the current study for more details.

Also, in our previous study [27] we demonstrate that the outlined types of incomplete historical data may arise naturally in a number of practical applications. For example, the interval uncertainty can be motivated by measurement errors or sensors detection limits in environmental measurements; see, e.g., [28]. Furthermore, in our problem setting the decision-maker may have access to random observations of a total cost with respect to some routes in the network; this type of feedback is also known as “bandit” feedback in online learning problem settings [10].

The key theoretical result of [27] indicates that the one-stage DRSP of the form (1) with a linear loss function  $\ell(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{y}$  can be reformulated as a robust shortest path problem with some polyhedral uncertainty set; see, e.g., [11] for a review of robust combinatorial optimization problems. Furthermore, the resulting problem admits a linear mixed-integer programming (MIP) reformulation and, thus, can be solved using off-the-shelf MIP solvers.

By construction in the one-stage formulation (1) the user selects a path here-and-now before the realization of uncertainty, i.e., some unknown distribution  $\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}$ . We, in turn, attempt to develop a multi-stage formulation of DRSP that may address the following research questions:

- Q1.** *Is there a benefit for the user to alter the chosen path, if it observes some additional distributional information while traversing through the network?*
- Q2.** *How much can the user gain by leveraging such adaptive decisions?*
- Q3.** *Can the resulting multi-stage formulation be solved at hand using off-the-shelf MIP solvers?*

The idea of our model can be summarized as follows. Let  $FS_i$  ( $RS_i$ ) be the sets of arcs directed out of (and into) node  $i \in N$ . We assume that if the user stays at some node  $i \in N$ , then it may observe some additional distributional information associated with the arcs  $a \in FS_i$  emanated from this node. We attempt to model this new information by introducing some *auxiliary distributional constraints* with respect to the arcs  $a \in FS_i$  (in addition to the constraints in  $\mathcal{Q}$  that are known to the user a priori) that can be *verified* by the user at node  $i$ . Simply speaking, the user forms a list of auxiliary constraints *at the beginning of the game*. Then for each constraint in the list the attacker decides whether it is satisfied or not and reveals its response, i.e., “yes” or “no”, to the user as soon as the user achieves the respective node in the network.

From the practical perspective, the auxiliary distributional constraints can be motivated, e.g., by some additional data observed by the user from Bluetooth sensors [20, 2] or GPS-equipped floating vehicles [37]. In other words, if the sensors are placed at some nodes in the given network, then the user may quantify the travel times between two successive detection stations; see, e.g., [20]. This additional information can be collected dynamically while traversing through the network and used to verify the auxiliary distributional constraints; we refer to Example 2 and Section 2.3 for a more comprehensive discussion.

Formally, the outlined problem unfolds in stages, where at each stage the attacker reveals (if necessary) some new distributional information to the user and the user picks a subsequent node of its path. Following the one-stage formulation in [27] we suppose that the user’s objective is to select a path with the least possible expected cost. The attacker, in turn, attempts to maximize the expected cost of the user’s path by selecting a distribution of arc costs from the ambiguity set  $\mathcal{Q}$ . As outlined before, some new distributional information can be revealed by the attacker dynamically during the game and, thus, both decision-makers are able to adjust their decisions at each node of the user’s path.

### 1.2. Related literature and our contributions

In this section we discuss existing multi-stage robust and distributionally robust formulations of the shortest path problem as well as our contributions upon the related studies. Traditionally, for problems with  $T \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  stages the decision variables are decoupled into here-and-now decisions (that are not affected by uncertainty) and wait-and-see resource decisions for each stage  $t \leq T$ . The recourse decisions at stage  $t$  can be viewed as *decision rules* or, equivalently, some functions of the uncertain parameters observed up to this stage; see, e.g., [18]. The major limitation of our problem setting is that the recourse decisions are discrete and, therefore, the application of standard linear or piecewise linear decision rules [6, 18] is rather limited.

With respect to *robust* optimization models, several studies explore multi-stage problems with binary recourse decisions and piecewise constant decision rules; see, e.g., [4, 5, 31, 33]. For example, Bertsimas and Dunning [4] suppose that the uncertain problem parameters are only known to reside within a polyhedral uncertainty set. The uncertainty set is partitioned into a number of disjoint polyhedrons and the recourse decisions are assumed to be piecewise constant functions on the generated subsets. This modeling approach enables to obtain approximations of multi-stage robust MIP problems, while the quality of approximation is adjusted by the choice of an appropriate partition scheme. In the following, we demonstrate that in our problem setting a similar piecewise constant construction of decision rules arises naturally due to the auxiliary constraints observed by the user.

An interesting version of multi-stage robust shortest path interdiction model is proposed by Sefair et al. [34]. In their setting the attacker can block a subset of arcs any time the user reaches a node in the network. After that, the user can respond by dynamically altering its path. Naturally, the problem unfolds in a number of stages, where at each stage the attacker blocks a subset of arcs emanated from the current user’s position and the user picks a subsequent node of its path. Furthermore, the total number of arcs that can be blocked by the attacker is bounded from above by the attacker’s budget.

The authors in [34] demonstrate that their dynamic interdiction problem can be solved in polynomial time for acyclic graphs and admits an exact exponential-state dynamic-programming

algorithm in the general case. In fact, the attacker’s decisions, i.e., blocking a subset of arcs, can be identified as a cost-increasing operation. Therefore, from the user’s perspective the model in [34] can be also classified as a multi-stage robust shortest path problem.

In contrast to robust formulations, multi-stage *distributionally robust* formulations with binary recourse decisions are considered by relatively few authors. First, we refer to the study by Hanasusanto et al. [21], where a two-stage DRO problem with binary recourse decisions is approximated by using a restricted number of preselected second-stage decisions. The authors prove that the proposed approximation is exact, if the number of preselected decisions is sufficiently large. Despite the fact that the study in [21] may address rather general types of ambiguity sets and objective criteria, it is not quite clear how to extend these theoretical results to a multi-stage problem setting.

Another line of research is focused on exact dynamic programming based algorithms assuming that the uncertain parameters are *stage-wise independent*. To the best of our knowledge, Yu and Shen [40] are among the first, who consider multi-stage distributionally robust MIPs. The authors investigate the concept of decision-dependent ambiguity sets, where the parameters of first- and second-order moment constraints at some stage  $t \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  are linearly dependent on the user’s decision at the previous stage,  $t - 1$ . The authors reformulate the stage-wise problems as linear MIP or semidefinite programming problems. Then different versions of stochastic dual dynamic integer programming (SDDiP) algorithm [41] are applied for solving the resulting multi-stage problems exactly or deriving objective bounds. The latter algorithm is shown to be finitely convergent and rather effective for moderate-sized problem instances.

In contrast to the aforementioned studies, the basic idea of our solution approach can be summarized as follows. As outlined earlier, the user forms a list of auxiliary distributional constraints and the attacker decides whether each constraint in the list is satisfied or not. In fact,  $K \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  auxiliary distributional constraints partition the ambiguity set  $\mathcal{Q}$  into  $2^K$  disjoint ambiguity sets, where each set corresponds to some feasible vector of attacker’s responses (recall that the attacker provides a binary response to each constraint.) If all responses are known to the user *a priori*, then it may identify the actual ambiguity set and solve the max-min problem (1) with respect to this set. For this reason, the user’s decision can be modeled as a *piecewise constant* function on the generated ambiguity sets. At the same time, we also need to address successive revelation of distributional information to the user. In this regard, we additionally enforce some non-anticipativity constraints; see, e.g., [4, 18], which guarantee that the user’s decision at some node cannot depend on future attacker’s responses.

The contributions of this study can be summarized as follows:

- Under some mild assumptions we reformulate the multi-stage DRSP as a one potentially large linear MIP problem. These results address our research question **Q3**.

- The obtained MIP reformulation is used in our computational study, where the quality of adaptive decisions is explored numerically; hence, we address the research questions **Q1** and **Q2**.
- In contrast to the study by Sefair et al. [34], we consider more general types of constraints from the attacker’s perspective (instead of a unique budget constraint) and account some partial distributional information available to the user; recall our discussion in Section 1.1.
- In contrast to the study by Yu and Shen [40], our model uses linear expectation constraints of the form (3), which make the uncertain parameters stage-wise dependent and thereby “destroys” dynamic programming based algorithms.
- Finally, our solution approach is, in a sense, similar to the one developed by Bertsimas and Dunning [4]. However, from the methodological point of view the partitions in [4] are not motivated by any practical applications and are used to provide a better approximation for the nominal multi-stage problem. Meanwhile, the partition of the ambiguity set  $\mathcal{Q}$  in our setting is motivated by the auxiliary distributional constraints observed by the user in the considered game.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we formulate the multi-stage DRSP as well as the related non-anticipativity constraints both for acyclic graphs and graphs of a general form. Also, we discuss how the auxiliary distributional constraints can be constructed and verified by using a sensor-related application context. In Section 3 we provide our linear mixed-integer programming reformulation of the multi-stage problem. In Section 4 we explore numerically how the quality of adaptive decisions and the computational tractability of the MIP reformulation scale in the number of auxiliary distributional constraints and the size of the network. Finally, Section 5 provides our conclusions and outlines possible directions for future research.

**Notation.** All vectors and matrices are labeled by bold letters. For a network  $G$  let  $N$  and  $A$  be its sets of nodes and directed arcs, respectively. For each node  $i \in N$  we refer to  $RS_i$  ( $FS_i$ ) as the set of arcs directed out of (and into) node  $i$ . The space of all probability distributions on  $\mathbb{R}^{|A|}$  is denoted as  $\mathcal{Q}_0(\mathbb{R}^{|A|})$ . Finally, for each  $a \in A$  we denote by  $\mathbb{Q}_a \in \mathcal{Q}_0(\mathbb{R})$  the marginal distribution induced by some joint distribution  $\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}_0(\mathbb{R}^{|A|})$ .

## 2. Base model

### 2.1. Modeling assumptions

As outlined in Section 1, we consider a directed weighted connected graph  $G := (N, A, \mathbf{c})$ , where  $N$  is a set of nodes,  $A$  is a set of directed arcs and  $\mathbf{c}$  is nonnegative cost vector. We also

denote by  $s$  and  $f$  the source and destination nodes in  $G$ , respectively. The distribution  $\mathbb{Q}$  of the cost vector  $\mathbf{c}$  is assumed to belong to an ambiguity set  $\mathcal{Q}$  formed by all distributions that satisfy the distributional constraints (2) and (3), i.e.,

$$\mathcal{Q} := \left\{ \mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}_0(\mathbb{R}^{|A|}) : \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\{\mathbf{B}\mathbf{c}\} \leq \mathbf{b}; \right. \\ \left. \mathbb{Q}_a\{c_a \in [l_a^{(j)}, u_a^{(j)}]\} \in [\underline{q}_a^{(j)}, \bar{q}_a^{(j)}] \quad \forall j \in \mathcal{D}_a, a \in A \right\} \quad (4)$$

Throughout the paper we make the following modeling assumptions:

- A1.** Each node  $i \in N$  is visited by the user at most once.
- A2.** Both the user and the attacker have complete information about the initial family of distributions  $\mathcal{Q}$  and the network  $G$ .
- A3.** In addition to the distributional constraints in  $\mathcal{Q}$ , the user forms a list  $\mathcal{L}$  of auxiliary distributional constraints given by:

$$\mathcal{L} := \bigcup_{i \in N \setminus \{f\}} \left\{ \mathbb{Q}_a\{c_a \in [\tilde{l}_a^{(j)}, \tilde{u}_a^{(j)}]\} \leq \tilde{q}_a^{(j)} \quad \forall j \in \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_a, \forall a \in FS_i; \right. \quad (5a)$$

$$\left. \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\left\{ \sum_{a \in FS_i} p_{ja} c_a \right\} \leq p_{j0} \quad \forall j \in \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_i \right\}, \quad (5b)$$

where,  $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_a = \{1, \dots, \tilde{d}_a\}$ ,  $a \in A$ , and  $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_i = \{1, \dots, \tilde{k}_i\}$ ,  $i \in N \setminus \{f\}$ , are potentially empty sets of indexes.

Assumption **A1** can be explained, e.g., by a nonstationarity in the attacker's distribution (a similar assumption is made by Xu and Mannor [39] with regard to distributionally robust Markov decision processes). Put differently, if the user returns to a node that has been visited before, then the attacker may simply modify the underlying distribution of arc costs. In this situation the user cannot exploit the collected distributional information and, hence, it is not favorable for the user to visit nodes multiple times. Additionally, Assumption **A1** enables to use standard path flow constraints in  $G$  as cycles are missing; see, e.g., [1, 36].

In Assumption **A2** we envision that the user has some initial information about the distribution of arc costs. As briefly outlined in Section 1.1, this information can be collected beforehand by leveraging some historical data. In general, the second assumption, **A2**, is rather standard in the robust and distributionally robust optimization literature. However, we refer to the studies in [8, 9, 26] for multi-stage shortest path interdiction models, in which the attacker has incomplete knowledge about the structure of the underlying network and observes the existence and precise costs of particular arcs by observing the user's decisions.




Figure 1: The network used in Example 1. The cost range is depicted inside each arc.

Finally, Assumption **A3** indicates that the distributional constraints in  $\mathcal{Q}$  and the auxiliary constraints are of the same form. In fact, each constraint in  $\mathcal{L}$  is either satisfied or not that corresponds to the attacker’s responses “yes” or “no”, respectively. In Section 3.2 we demonstrate that Assumption **A3** is necessary for deriving a linear MIP reformulation of the proposed multi-stage optimization model. Furthermore, if the user stays at some node  $i \in N \setminus \{f\}$ , then revealing future attacker’s decisions outside of  $FS_i$  allows the user to effectively mitigate the impact of observed distributional constraints and, hence, it turns out to be unfavorable for the attacker. In conclusion, we note that the constraints (5a) and (5b) are necessary only if they refine the initial distributional constraints in  $\mathcal{Q}$ . A possible verification of this property is discussed in more details within Section 3.2.

In the following example we provide some intuition behind the auxiliary distributional constraints (5) as well as the first and second research questions, **Q1** and **Q2**, from Section 1.1.

**Example 1.** Consider a network  $G$  depicted in Figure 1 and let  $s = 1$ ,  $f = 8$ . We suppose that arc costs satisfy the support constraints  $l_a \leq c_a \leq u_a$  outlined inside each arc, i.e.,  $c_a \in [l_a, u_a]$  with probability 1. Furthermore, we introduce a unique linear expectation constraint given by:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{Q}}\left\{\sum_{a \in A'} c_a\right\} \leq 1, \tag{6}$$

where  $A' := \{(2, 4), (2, 5), (3, 6), (3, 7)\}$ . Next, we consider three different cases with respect to the additional distributional information *observed by the user*:

- **Case 1 (no additional information).** Assume that the user picks a complete  $s - f$  path *first* and does not observe any additional distributional information. Since any user’s path contains exactly one arc from  $A'$ , the attacker sets the expected of this arc equal to 1 and, thus, the worst-case expected loss incurred by the user is also equal to 1.

- **Case 2 (full information).** Naturally, the lower bound on the user’s expected loss can be obtained, if the attacker reveals the distribution of arc costs,  $\mathbb{Q}$ , before the user picks any feasible path. Since the user’s path is not known in advance, the optimal attacker’s decision is to set expected costs of 0.25 for each arc in  $A'$ . Then the user’s worst-case expected loss equals 0.25.
- **Case 2 (successive revelation of information).** Assume that, if the user stays at node 2, then it may compare the expected costs of (2, 4) and (2, 5). In other words, the attacker indicates whether the following linear expectation constraint holds or not:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\{c_{(2,4)} - c_{(2,5)}\} \leq 0$$

In this case it is optimal for the user to traverse through (1, 2) and then to pick an arc with the smallest expected cost. In fact, the expected cost of the latter arc cannot exceed 0.5 due to the initial constraint (6), which results in the worst-case expected loss of 0.5.

Comparing the first and the third cases we conclude that the user may benefit from using dynamic decisions. Meanwhile, the user’s expected loss in our setting is bounded from below by the optimal objective value of the *max-min problem*, i.e., the one-stage problem (1) where the order of “max” and “min” operators is reversed.  $\square$

## 2.2. Multi-stage formulation

As outlined before, the ambiguity set and the list of auxiliary distributional constraints in our setting are given, respectively, by (4) and (5). Furthermore, in view of Assumption **A1**, the user aims to minimize its expected loss by traversing through some simple *s-f* path in the network  $G$ . In this regard, we define a set  $Y$  of all feasible path-incidence vectors, that is,

$$Y = \left\{ \mathbf{y} \in \{0, 1\}^{|A|} : \sum_{a \in FS_i} y_a - \sum_{a \in RS_i} y_a = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } i = s \\ -1 & \text{if } i = f \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \forall i \in N \right. \quad (7a)$$

$$\left. \sum_{a \in FS_i} y_a \leq 1 \quad \forall i \in N \right\} \quad (7b)$$

Here, constraints (7a) are standard flow conservation constraints, whereas constraints (7b) ensure that each node is visited at most once; see, e.g., [36]. Recall that negative cycles are prohibited by the support constraints, i.e., probability constraints (2) for each  $a \in A$  and  $j = 1$ .

Following our discussion in Section 1.2 we encode all feasible attacker’s responses to the constraints in  $\mathcal{L}$  with binary vectors  $\mathbf{r}_j \in \{0, 1\}^{|\mathcal{L}|}$  for  $j \in \{1, \dots, 2^{|\mathcal{L}|}\}$ . In particular, for any fixed  $j$  we observe that  $r_{jm} = 1$ , if the  $m$ -th constraint in  $\mathcal{L}$  is satisfied and  $r_{jm} = 0$ , otherwise.

For each vector of attacker's responses  $\mathbf{r}_j$ ,  $j \in \{1, \dots, 2^{|\mathcal{L}|}\}$ , we construct a new ambiguity set  $\mathcal{Q}_j$  that combines the initial distributional constraints in  $\mathcal{Q}$  with the auxiliary constraints induced by  $\mathbf{r}_j$ . For ease of exposition we refer to “ $v \geq w$ ” as an opposite constraint to “ $v \leq w$ ”. Formally, for each  $j \in \{1, \dots, 2^{|\mathcal{L}|}\}$  we have:

$$\mathcal{Q}_j := \mathcal{Q} \cap \left\{ \mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}_0(\mathbb{R}^{|A|}) \text{ s.t. } \begin{cases} \text{the } m\text{-th constraint in } \mathcal{L}, \text{ if } r_{jm} = 1 \\ \text{an opposite of the } m\text{-th constraint in } \mathcal{L}, \text{ if } r_{jm} = 0 \end{cases} \right\}$$

Irrespective of the order of the auxiliary distributional constraints in  $\mathcal{L}$ , the multi-stage DRSP can be formulated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{j \in \{1, \dots, 2^{|\mathcal{L}|}\}} \min_{\mathbf{y}_j \in Y} \max_{\mathbb{Q}_j \in \mathcal{Q}_j} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}_j} \{ \mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{y}_j \} \\ & \text{s.t. non-anticipativity constraints with respect to } \mathbf{y}_j, j \in \{1, \dots, 2^{|\mathcal{L}|}\}, \end{aligned} \tag{F_{ms}}$$

where  $\mathbf{y}_j$ ,  $j \in \{1, \dots, 2^{|\mathcal{L}|}\}$ , denotes a decision of the user under complete knowledge of the vector of attacker's responses,  $\mathbf{r}_j$ . Therefore, the user attempts to minimize its worst-case expected loss across all possible realizations of attacker's responses and subject to some non-anticipativity constraints.

As outlined earlier, we need to enforce non-anticipativity as long as the user learns the attacker's responses associated with some node  $i \in N \setminus \{f\}$  only when it reaches the node  $i$ . Therefore, for any fixed  $j, \ell \in \{1, \dots, 2^{|\mathcal{L}|}\}$  the user's paths  $P_j$  and  $P_\ell$  (induced by the incidence vectors  $\mathbf{y}_j$  and  $\mathbf{y}_\ell$ , respectively) must coincide whenever the user is not able to distinguish between the ambiguity sets  $\mathcal{Q}_j$  and  $\mathcal{Q}_\ell$ .

In this regard, for any fixed  $j, \ell \in \{1, \dots, 2^{|\mathcal{L}|}\}$ ,  $j \neq \ell$ , we denote by  $N_{j,\ell} \subseteq N$  a set of nodes at which the user may learn the actual ambiguity set, either  $\mathcal{Q}_j$  or  $\mathcal{Q}_\ell$ , that is enforced by the attacker. More specifically, for every node in  $N_{j,\ell}$  there exists an associated distributional constraint in  $\mathcal{L}$  such that the attacker's responses to this constraint in  $\mathbf{r}_j$  and  $\mathbf{r}_\ell$  are different. As a remark, in Example 1 we have  $|\mathcal{L}| = 1$  and  $N_{1,2} = \{2\}$ . The following result provides non-anticipativity constraints for acyclic graphs.

**Proposition 1.** *Assume that  $j, \ell \in \{1, \dots, 2^{|\mathcal{L}|}\}$ ,  $j \neq \ell$ , and let  $G$  be a directed acyclic graph. Then for each node  $i \in N \setminus N_{j,\ell}$  the following constraints ensure non-anticipativity:*

$$y_{j,a} = y_{\ell,a} \quad \forall a \in FS_i, \text{ if all nodes in } N_{j,\ell} \text{ are reachable from } i \tag{8a}$$

$$\left. \begin{aligned} |y_{j,a} - y_{\ell,a}| &\leq \sum_{n \in \tilde{N}_{j,\ell}} \sum_{a' \in FS_n} y_{j,a'} \quad \forall a \in FS_i, \\ &\text{if a subset of nodes } \tilde{N}_{j,\ell} \subseteq N_{j,\ell} \text{ is not reachable from } i \end{aligned} \right\} \tag{8b}$$

*Proof.* We consider three particular situations:

- (i) Assume that for some node  $i \in N \setminus N_{j,\ell}$  all nodes in  $N_{j,\ell}$  are reachable from  $i$ . Then any node in  $N_{j,\ell}$  can be visited by the user only after node  $i$  since the graph  $G$  is acyclic. Hence, at node  $i$  we have a lack of information to distinguish between the ambiguity sets  $\mathcal{Q}_j$  and  $\mathcal{Q}_\ell$ . which results in constraints (8a).
- (ii) Assume that for some node  $i \in N \setminus N_{j,\ell}$  a subset of nodes  $\tilde{N}_{j,\ell} \subseteq N_{j,\ell}$  is not reachable from  $i$ . In view of the first part of non-anticipativity constraints (8a) and the definition of  $\tilde{N}_{j,\ell}$ , it is rather straightforward to check that either both paths induced by  $\mathbf{y}_j$  and  $\mathbf{y}_\ell$  contain *some* node in  $\tilde{N}_{j,\ell}$  or both not. In fact, non-anticipativity at node  $i$  is needed only if the user's path induced by  $\mathbf{y}_j$ , say  $P_j$ , does not contain any node in  $\tilde{N}_{j,\ell}$ , i.e.,

$$\sum_{n \in \tilde{N}_{j,\ell}} \sum_{a' \in FS_n} y_{j,a'} = 0,$$

see constraints (8b). Otherwise, there exists some node  $n \in P_j \cap \tilde{N}_{j,\ell}$  and we have either  $i \notin P_j$  or  $i \in P_j$  and is visited after  $n$ ; recall the definition of  $\tilde{N}_{j,\ell}$ . In both cases the constraints (8a) with the flow conservation constraints (7a) are sufficient to guarantee non-anticipativity and, thus, we make the constraints (8b) non-binding.

- (iii) If the user stays at some node  $i \in N_{j,\ell}$ , then it may distinguish between the ambiguity sets  $\mathcal{Q}_j$  and  $\mathcal{Q}_\ell$ . Hence, we do not need to enforce non-anticipativity constraints.

These observations conclude the proof. □

We note that reachability in the formulation of Proposition 1 can be checked efficiently for each pair of nodes, e.g., by Floyd-Warshall algorithm; see [13]. Furthermore, constraints (8a) and (8b) are, in fact, linear constraints with respect to the decision variables.

Unfortunately, the non-anticipativity constraints become substantially more complicated for general graphs. Indeed, there may exist a cycle containing some node  $i \in N \setminus N_{j,\ell}$  and  $i' \in N_{j,\ell}$  for some fixed  $j, \ell \in \{1, \dots, 2^{|\mathcal{L}|}\}$ . In this case we need to enforce non-anticipativity at node  $i$  only if the node  $i'$  is visited by the user after  $i$ . For example, in Figure 2 we consider a general graph, where the non-anticipativity requirement (8a) for acyclic graphs is violated. Indeed, all nodes in  $N_{j,\ell} = \{2, 4\}$  are reachable from node 5, but we do not need to enforce non-anticipativity at this node as node 2 is visited before.

In order to resolve the outlined issue, we introduce new variables  $\mathbf{t}_j \in \mathbb{R}^{|N|}$ ,  $j \in \{1, \dots, 2^{|\mathcal{L}|}\}$ , related to a sequence at which nodes are visited by the user under scenario  $\mathbf{y}_j$ ; see constraints (9a)-(9c) in the formulation of Proposition 2 below. For instance, in Figure 2 we depict some feasible values of  $\mathbf{t}_j$  associated with the user's path  $P_j$ . As a remark, similar variables and constraints are used in the Miller–Tucker–Zemlin (MTZ) formulation of the travelling salesmen problem [29]. The following result holds for general graphs.




Figure 2: A pair of user's decisions satisfying the non-anticipativity requirement for some  $j, \ell \in \{1, \dots, 2^{|\mathcal{L}|}\}$ . The set  $N_{j,\ell}$  is assumed to contain two nodes, 2 and 4, depicted in red. Some feasible values of  $\mathbf{t}_j$  are depicted outside the nodes of  $P_j$ .

**Proposition 2.** *Assume that  $j, \ell \in \{1, \dots, 2^{|\mathcal{L}|}\}$ ,  $j \neq \ell$ . Then for each node  $i \in N \setminus N_{j,\ell}$  the following constraints ensure non-anticipativity:*

$$t_{j,s} = 0 \tag{9a}$$

$$0 \leq t_{j,i} \leq |N| - 1 \quad \forall i \in N \tag{9b}$$

$$t_{j,a_1} - t_{j,a_2} \leq -1 + |N|(1 - y_{j,a}) \quad \forall a \in A \tag{9c}$$

$$|y_{j,a} - y_{\ell,a}| \leq \sum_{n \in N_{j,\ell}} \min \left\{ \max\{t_{j,i} - t_{j,n}; 0\} + 2 - \sum_{a' \in FS_n} y_{j,a'} - \sum_{a' \in FS_i} y_{j,a'}; \sum_{a' \in FS_n} y_{j,a'} \right\} \quad \forall a \in FS_i \tag{9d}$$

*Proof.* Henceforth, we fix  $j, \ell \in \{1, \dots, 2^{|\mathcal{L}|}\}$ ,  $j \neq \ell$ . First, we note that the decision vector  $\mathbf{y}_j \in Y$  induces some simple  $s - f$  path

$$P_j = \{n_1 \rightarrow n_2 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow n_{T+1}\},$$

where  $n_1 = s$ ,  $n_{T+1} = f$  and any intermediate node is visited at most once. In fact, constraints (9a)-(9c) assign labels  $\mathbf{t}_j$  to each node  $i \in N$  so that the label at  $s$  is equal to 0 and the labels at each subsequent node in  $P_j$  are incremented at least by one compared to the predecessor node. Each label is also bounded from above by  $|N| - 1$ , which is the maximal possible length of a simple path in  $G$ .

Next, we note that the user's paths  $P_j$  and  $P_\ell$  (induced by the incidence vectors  $\mathbf{y}_j$  and  $\mathbf{y}_\ell$ , respectively) must coincide until some node  $n \in N_{j,\ell}$  is reached. This observation alludes that non-anticipativity constraints are necessary only for the nodes of  $P_j$  and  $P_\ell$  that are visited

before  $n$ . We consider two particular cases:

- (i) Assume that the user stays at some node  $i \in N \setminus N_{j,\ell}$ . Then non-anticipativity at  $i$  is needed only if *all* the nodes in  $N_{j,\ell}$  are either not contained in  $P_j$  or are visited after node  $i$  assuming that  $i \in P_j$ . Hence, for each node  $n \in N_{j,\ell}$  we verify whether this node is contained in  $P_j$  and whether it is visited before or after node  $i$ .

Formally, we calculate the following indicators:

$$w_{j,i,n} = \min \left\{ \max\{t_{j,i} - t_{j,n}; 0\} + 2 - \sum_{a' \in FS_n} y_{j,a'} - \sum_{a' \in FS_i} y_{j,a'}; \sum_{a' \in FS_n} y_{j,a'} \right\}$$

We observe that, if  $n$  is not contained in  $P_j$ , then  $\sum_{a' \in FS_n} y_{j,a'} = 0$  and, hence,  $w_{j,i,n} = 0$ ; recall that  $\mathbf{y}_j$  must satisfy (7b). Otherwise, if  $n$  is contained in  $P_j$ , then

$$w_{j,i,n} = \min \left\{ \max\{t_{j,i} - t_{j,n}; 0\} + 1 - \sum_{a' \in FS_i} y_{j,a'}; 1 \right\}$$

In this case,  $w_{j,i,n} = 0$  only if  $i \in P_j$ , i.e.,  $\sum_{a' \in FS_i} y_{j,a'} = 1$ , and  $n$  is visited after  $i$ , i.e.,  $t_{j,i} \leq t_{j,n} - 1$ . Otherwise, if  $n$  is visited before  $i$  or  $i \notin P_j$ , then  $w_{j,i,n} = 1$ . As a result, we conclude that non-anticipativity is guaranteed by the constraints (9d).

- (ii) If the user stays at some node  $i \in N_{j,\ell}$ , then it may distinguish between the ambiguity sets  $\mathcal{Q}_j$  and  $\mathcal{Q}_\ell$ . Hence, we do not need to enforce non-anticipativity constraints.

These observations conclude the proof.  $\square$

Similar to Proposition 1 the non-anticipativity constraints (9a) - (9d) can be reformulated as linear constraints, but after applying some standard linearization techniques. We discuss this point as well as a linear MIP reformulation of  $(\mathbf{F}_{ms})$  in Section 3. In the remainder of this section we explore how the auxiliary distributional constraints given by (5) can be constructed from real data observations.

### 2.3. Construction of the auxiliary constraints from data

The results of this section are motivated and similar to the related results of Section 2.2 in [27], where the initial distributional constraints in  $\mathcal{Q}$  are constructed from data. In the following, we assume that the attacker fixes some nominal distribution  $\mathbb{Q}^* \in \mathcal{Q}$  and has access to a data set given by  $\hat{n} \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$  independent observations obtained from this distribution, i.e.,

$$\hat{\mathbf{C}} := \left\{ (\hat{c}_1^{(k)}, \dots, \hat{c}_{|A|}^{(k)})^\top, k \in \{1, \dots, \hat{n}\} \right\} \quad (10)$$

We note that an optimal solution of  $(\mathbf{F}_{ms})$  provides a user's decision for every feasible vector of attacker's responses. However it seems to be reasonable for the user to identify the actual

sequence of attacker's responses. In this regard, we need to verify the auxiliary constraints (5) *after* solving the multi-stage formulation ( $\mathbf{F}_{ms}$ ). Formally, we use the data set (10) and attempt to verify the auxiliary constraints (5) dynamically at the respective nodes of the user's path. This procedure is referred to as a *constraint verification procedure*.

**Verification of probability constraints.** Suppose that the user stays at some node  $i \in N \setminus \{f\}$ , and needs to verify a probability constraint of the form

$$q_a^* := \mathbb{Q}_a^* \{c_a \in [\tilde{l}_a, \tilde{u}_a]\} \leq \tilde{q}_a \quad (11)$$

for some  $a \in FS_i$ . Then the nominal probability  $q_a^*$  can be estimated using the empirical probability  $\frac{1}{\hat{n}} \sum_{k=1}^{\hat{n}} \chi_{a,k}$ , where for each  $k \in \{1, \dots, \hat{n}\}$

$$\chi_{a,k} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \hat{c}_a^{(k)} \in [\tilde{l}_a, \tilde{u}_a] \\ 0, & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases}$$

recall the definition (10). Furthermore, Hoeffding inequality [22] for the sum of bounded i.i.d. random variables implies that for any  $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\Pr \left\{ \left| q_a^* - \frac{1}{\hat{n}} \sum_{k=1}^{\hat{n}} \chi_{a,k} \right| \geq \varepsilon \right\} \leq 2 \exp(-2\hat{n}\varepsilon^2) \quad (12)$$

Hence, with any prescribed confidence level  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  we may guarantee that

$$q_a^* \in \left[ \frac{1}{\hat{n}} \sum_{k=1}^{\hat{n}} \chi_{a,k} - \varepsilon, \frac{1}{\hat{n}} \sum_{k=1}^{\hat{n}} \chi_{a,k} + \varepsilon \right],$$

where the parameter  $\varepsilon$  is defined by setting the right-hand side of (12) equal to the probability of violation,  $1 - \gamma$ . As a remark, using the same arguments one may construct the initial probability constraints (2).

Furthermore, if the number of samples,  $\hat{n}$ , is sufficiently large (and, therefore,  $\varepsilon$  is sufficiently small), then we may distinguish between the following two alternatives:

$$\frac{1}{\hat{n}} \sum_{k=1}^{\hat{n}} \chi_{a,k} + \varepsilon \leq \tilde{q}_a \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{1}{\hat{n}} \sum_{k=1}^{\hat{n}} \chi_{a,k} - \varepsilon > \tilde{q}_a$$

In the former case the constraint (11) holds with probability of at least  $\gamma$ , whereas in the latter case it is violated with probability of at least  $\gamma$ . Importantly, in order to verify a constraint of the form (11) it suffices to know only the number of random samples that belong to the interval  $[\tilde{l}_a, \tilde{u}_a]$ . Also, if the constraint cannot be verified with  $\hat{n}$  samples, then one may generate an

attacker's response at random or assume the worst-case scenario for the user. We exploit some variation of this idea within our numerical study in Section 4.

**Verification of linear expectation constraints.** In a similar way, one may verify a linear expectation constraint of the form:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}^*} \left\{ \sum_{a \in FS_i} p_a c_a \right\} \leq p_0 \quad (13)$$

for some  $p_a \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $a \in FS_i$ , and  $p_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ . That is, by Hoeffding inequality we observe that:

$$\Pr \left\{ \left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}^*} \left\{ \sum_{a \in FS_i} p_a c_a \right\} - \frac{1}{\hat{n}} \sum_{k=1}^{\hat{n}} \sum_{a \in FS_i} p_a \hat{c}_a^{(k)} \right| \geq \varepsilon \right\} \leq 2 \exp \left( -2\hat{n} \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{\bar{S}_i - \underline{S}_i} \right)^2 \right), \quad (14)$$

where  $\bar{S}_i = \sum_{a \in FS_i} \max_{c_a \in [l_a, u_a]} p_a c_a$ ,  $\underline{S}_i = \sum_{a \in FS_i} \min_{c_a \in [l_a, u_a]} p_a c_a$  and  $i \in N \setminus \{f\}$ . Then for any confidence level  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  we may guarantee that:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}^*} \left\{ \sum_{a \in FS_i} p_a c_a \right\} \in \left[ \frac{1}{\hat{n}} \sum_{k=1}^{\hat{n}} \sum_{a \in FS_i} p_a \hat{c}_a^{(k)} - \varepsilon, \frac{1}{\hat{n}} \sum_{k=1}^{\hat{n}} \sum_{a \in FS_i} p_a \hat{c}_a^{(k)} + \varepsilon \right],$$

where  $\varepsilon$  is defined by setting the right-hand side of (14) equal to  $1 - \gamma$ . As in the previous case, the above procedure can be slightly modified to construct the initial expectation constraints (3).

We note that the constraint (13) can be verified following the same arguments as for the probability constraint (11). However, in contrast to (12), the inequality (14) exploits linear combinations of arc costs with respect to the arcs  $a \in FS_i$ . In the following example we demonstrate how the auxiliary constraints (5a) and (5b) can be constructed and verified by using information from Bluetooth sensors.

**Example 2.** We envision a weighted directed network, where the arc costs/travel times are measured using Bluetooth sensors [2, 20] or GPS-equipped floating vehicles [37]. The travel time estimates obtained from sensors are subject to measurement errors and, thus, can be viewed as random observations of the ground truth arc travel times. For example, in Figure 3a the sensors are placed at nodes  $O$ ,  $F$  and  $K$ , which yields that the user may receive random samples with respect to individual arc travel times,  $c_{OF}$  and  $c_{OK}$ . Following our discussion above, we consider the following two alternatives:

- the obtained random samples are not subject to uncertainty. In this case a linear expectation constraint of the form (5b) for the expected costs of  $c_{OF}$  and/or  $c_{OK}$  can be constructed and verified;
- the random observations of arc travel times are subject to interval uncertainty (e.g., if




Figure 3: In each figure we consider different allocations of Bluetooth sensors, i.e., the sensors are placed at nodes highlighted in blue. The arc travel times  $c_{OF}$  and  $c_{FO}$  are assumed to be the same.

the sensors may only limit the average speed [12]). In this case one may construct and verify a probability constraint of the form (5a).

Some more advanced allocations of sensors that give rise to the linear expectation constraints of the form (5b) are depicted in Figures 3b and 3c. That is, in Figure 3b the sensors are placed only at nodes  $F$ ,  $K$  and some preceding node  $E$ . Hence, the user may calculate only the difference  $c_{OF} - c_{OK}$  by observing the sums  $c_{EO} + c_{OF}$  and  $c_{EO} + c_{OK}$ . On the other hand, in Figure 3c we suppose that the marginal distributions of  $c_{OF}$  and  $c_{FO}$  coincide, which is reasonable, e.g., if the road is free of traffic. In this situation the user may observe the total cost  $c_{OF} + c_{OK}$ , if the sensors identify a vehicle that traverses from  $F$  to  $K$ .  $\square$

We conclude that the auxiliary distributional constraints (5a) and (5b) can be motivated in a rather straightforward way by the outlined sensor-related application context. Some further intuition behind the choice of the auxiliary distributional constraints (5a) and (5b) is implied by our solution procedure for the multi-stage problem  $(\mathbf{F}_{ms})$  and is discussed within Section 3.

### 3. Solution approach

In this section we describe our solution approach for the multi-stage DRSP (  $\mathbf{F}_{ms}$  ). The remainder of the section is organized as follows. In Section 3.1 we outline a mixed-integer programming (MIP) reformulation of the one-stage DRSP proposed in [27]. In Section 3.2 we exploit the results of [27] and standard linear programming duality to reformulate the multi-stage DRSP (  $\mathbf{F}_{ms}$  ) as a linear MIP problem.

#### 3.1. MIP reformulation of the one-stage problem

Recall that the one-stage problem in [27] can be expressed as:

$$z_{static}^* := \min_{\mathbf{y} \in Y} \max_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}} \{ \mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{y} \}, \quad (\mathbf{F}_{os})$$

where the ambiguity set  $\mathcal{Q}$  and the set of feasible decisions  $Y$  are given by equations (4) and (7), respectively. Henceforth,  $(\mathbf{F}_{os})$  is referred to as a *static problem* and its optimal objective function value is denoted by  $z_{static}^*$ .

It turns out that DRSP (  $\mathbf{F}_{os}$  ) can be recast as a robust shortest path problem with some polyhedral uncertainty set. More specifically, the following result holds.

**Theorem 1.** (*Theorem 2 in [27]*) *Assume that*

$$\mathcal{S}_0 := \{\bar{\mathbf{c}} \in \mathbb{R}^{|A|} : \mathbf{L} \leq \bar{\mathbf{c}} \leq \mathbf{U}; \quad \mathbf{B}\bar{\mathbf{c}} \leq \mathbf{b}\},$$

where for each  $a \in A$

$$L_a := \min_{\mathbb{Q}_a \in \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_a} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}_a}\{c_a\}, \quad (15a)$$

$$U_a := \max_{\mathbb{Q}_a \in \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_a} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}_a}\{c_a\}, \quad (15b)$$

and

$$\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_a := \left\{ \mathbb{Q}_a \in \mathcal{Q}_0(\mathbb{R}) : \mathbb{Q}_a\{c_a \in [l_a^{(i)}, u_a^{(i)}]\} \in [q_a^{(i)}, \bar{q}_a^{(i)}] \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{D}_a \right\}$$

Then the distributionally robust shortest path problem of the form (1) is equivalent to the following robust shortest path problem with polyhedral uncertainty:

$$\min_{\mathbf{y} \in Y} \max_{\bar{\mathbf{c}} \in \mathcal{S}_0} \bar{\mathbf{c}}^\top \mathbf{y} \quad (\text{RSPP})$$

The intuition behind Theorem 1 can be explained as follows. Since the objective function in  $(\mathbf{F}_{os})$  is linear, it can be seen as a function of expected costs,  $\bar{\mathbf{c}} := \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\{\mathbf{c}\}$ , i.e.,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\{\mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{y}\} = (\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\{\mathbf{c}\})^\top \mathbf{y} = \bar{\mathbf{c}}^\top \mathbf{y}$$

One may also show that the individual probability constraints (2) for each  $a \in A$  can be expressed in terms of box constraints

$$L_a \leq \bar{c}_a \leq U_a$$

with respect to the expected costs  $\bar{c}_a$ , which yields the desired result.

In order to reformulate the moment problems (15a) and (15b), we make the following additional assumptions:

**A4.** For each  $a \in A$  there exists a marginal distribution  $\mathbb{Q}_a \in \mathcal{Q}_0(\mathbb{R})$  such that

$$\mathbb{Q}_a\{l_a^{(i)} \leq c_a \leq u_a^{(i)}\} \in (q_a^{(i)}, \bar{q}_a^{(i)}),$$

whenever  $\underline{q}_a^{(i)} < \overline{q}_a^{(i)}$ ,  $i \in \mathcal{D}_a$ .

**A5.** For each  $a \in A$  and any pair of subintervals in (2), namely,  $[l_a^{(i_1)}, u_a^{(i_1)}]$  and  $[l_a^{(i_2)}, u_a^{(i_2)}]$ ,  $i_1, i_2 \in \mathcal{D}_a$ , we have  $l_a^{(i_1)} \neq u_a^{(i_2)}$  and  $l_a^{(i_2)} \neq u_a^{(i_1)}$ .

In particular, Assumption **A4** coincides with the assumption made by Wiesemann et al. [38] and serves as a constraint qualification condition for moment problems [35]. It can also be verified that Assumption **A4** is readily satisfied, if the probability constraints (2) are constructed from data; see Section 2.2 in [27]. The second assumption, **A5**, is rather technical and verifies that the extremum in (15a) and (15b) can be attained. This assumption is not restrictive in general as it can be always satisfied by a small perturbation of the subinterval's endpoints. Finally, both Assumptions **A4** and **A5** guarantee that strong duality for the moment problems (15a) and (15b) holds. This prerequisite allows us to obtain finite linear programming reformulations of (15a) and (15b); we refer to Lemma 2 in [27] for further details.

Summarizing the discussion above the one-stage formulation in [27] can be tackled by solving  $2|A|$  linear programming problems and a single robust shortest path problem (RSPP). Importantly, the latter can be recast as a linear MIP problem by dualizing the second-level linear programming problem. Formally, the following result holds.

**Proposition 3** (*Theorem 3 in [27]*). *Let*

$$\mathcal{S}_0 := \left\{ \bar{\mathbf{c}} \in \mathbb{R}^{|A|} : \mathbf{L} \leq \bar{\mathbf{c}} \leq \mathbf{U}; \quad \mathbf{B}\bar{\mathbf{c}} \leq \mathbf{b} \right\} = \left\{ \bar{\mathbf{c}} \in \mathbb{R}^{|A|} : \mathbf{B}_0\bar{\mathbf{c}} \leq \mathbf{b}_0 \right\} \quad (16)$$

*Then the one-stage DRSP (F<sub>os</sub>) admits the following mixed-integer programming reformulation:*

$$z_{static}^* = \min_{\mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}} \left\{ \mathbf{b}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda} : \boldsymbol{\lambda} \geq 0, \quad -\mathbf{y} + \mathbf{B}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda} = 0, \quad \mathbf{y} \in Y \right\} \quad (17)$$

### 3.2. MIP reformulation of the multi-stage problem

The key observation that we use next is that each family of distributions  $\mathcal{Q}_j$ ,  $j \in \{1, \dots, 2^{|L|}\}$  (corresponding to a vector of attacker's responses  $\mathbf{r}_j \in \{0, 1\}^{|L|}$ ), contains the same types of distributional constraints as those in  $\mathcal{Q}$ ; recall Assumption **A3**. Therefore, in view of Theorem 1, each ambiguity set  $\mathcal{Q}_j$ ,  $j \in \{1, \dots, 2^{|L|}\}$ , can be seen as some polyhedral uncertainty set

$$\mathcal{S}_j := \left\{ \bar{\mathbf{c}} \in \mathbb{R}^{|A|} : \mathbf{B}_j\bar{\mathbf{c}} \leq \mathbf{b}_j \right\} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_0 \quad (18)$$

in terms of the expected costs. Next, we provide a linear MIP reformulation of the multi-stage problem (F<sub>ms</sub>).

**Theorem 2.** *Let G be a general graph and assume that each ambiguity set  $\mathcal{Q}_j$ ,  $j \in \{1, \dots, 2^{|L|}\}$ , is described by the polyhedral uncertainty set  $\mathcal{S}_j$  given by equation (18). Also, set  $M_1 = |N| - 1$ .*

Then the multi-stage DRSP ( $\mathbf{F}_{ms}$ ) can be reformulated as the following mixed-integer programming problem:

$$z_{dynamic}^* = \min_{\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}, z} z \quad (19a)$$

$$\left. \begin{aligned} & t_{j,s} = 0 \\ \text{s.t. } & 0 \leq t_{j,i} \leq |N| - 1 \quad \forall i \in N \\ & t_{j,a_1} - t_{j,a_2} \leq -1 + |N|(1 - y_{j,a}) \quad \forall a \in A \end{aligned} \right\} \forall j \in \{1, \dots, 2^{|\mathcal{L}|}\} \quad (19b)$$

$$\left. \begin{aligned} & v_{j,i,n} \geq 0 \\ & v_{j,i,n} \geq t_{j,i} - t_{j,n} \\ & v_{j,i,n} \leq M_1 \tilde{v}_{j,i,n} \\ & v_{j,i,n} \leq t_{j,i} - t_{j,n} + M_1(1 - \tilde{v}_{j,i,n}) \\ & w_{j,i,n} \leq v_{j,i,n} + 2 - \sum_{a' \in FS_n} y_{j,a'} - \sum_{a' \in FS_i} y_{j,a'} \\ & w_{j,i,n} \leq \sum_{a' \in FS_n} y_{j,a'} \\ & - \sum_{\tilde{n} \in N_{j,\ell}} w_{j,i,\tilde{n}} \leq y_{j,a} - y_{\ell,a} \leq \sum_{\tilde{n} \in N_{j,\ell}} w_{j,i,\tilde{n}} \quad \forall a \in FS_i \\ & \tilde{v}_{j,i,n} \in \{0, 1\} \end{aligned} \right\} \begin{aligned} & \forall j, \ell \in \{1, \dots, 2^{|\mathcal{L}|}\}, \\ & \forall n \in N_{j,\ell}, \\ & \forall i \in N \setminus N_{j,\ell}, \\ & j \neq \ell \end{aligned} \quad (19c)$$

$$\left. \begin{aligned} & z \geq \mathbf{b}_j^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}_j \\ & -\mathbf{y}_j + \mathbf{B}_j^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}_j = 0 \\ & \boldsymbol{\lambda}_j \geq 0 \\ & \mathbf{y}_j \in Y \end{aligned} \right\} \forall j \in \{1, \dots, 2^{|\mathcal{L}|}\} \quad (19d)$$

*Proof.* First, we provide an epigraph reformulation of ( $\mathbf{F}_{ms}$ ) by using an auxiliary variable  $z \in \mathbb{R}$ , that is,

$$\min z \quad (20a)$$

$$\text{s.t. non-anticipativity constraints (9),} \quad (20b)$$

$$z \geq \min_{\mathbf{y}_j \in Y} \max_{\mathbb{Q}_j \in \mathcal{Q}_j} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}_j} \{\mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{y}_j\} \quad \forall j \in \{1, \dots, 2^{|\mathcal{L}|}\} \quad (20c)$$

Next, the minimum in the right-hand side of (20c) indicates that for each  $j \in \{1, \dots, 2^{|\mathcal{L}|}\}$  there exists some  $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_j \in Y$  such that

$$z \geq \max_{\mathbb{Q}_j \in \mathcal{Q}_j} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}_j} \{\mathbf{c}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_j\}$$

Hence, the path flow constraints  $\mathbf{y}_j \in Y$  can be shifted to the first-level problem constraints by omitting the minimum in the right-hand side of (20c). In other words, the optimization

problem (20) admits the following equivalent reformulation:

$$\min_{z, \mathbf{y}} z \tag{21a}$$

$$\text{s.t. non-anticipativity constraints (9),} \tag{21b}$$

$$z \geq \max_{\mathbb{Q}_j \in \mathcal{Q}_j} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}_j} \{\mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{y}_j\} \quad \forall j \in \{1, \dots, 2^{|\mathcal{L}|}\} \tag{21c}$$

$$\mathbf{y}_j \in Y \quad \forall j \in \{1, \dots, 2^{|\mathcal{L}|}\} \tag{21d}$$

Then in view of Theorem 1 constraints (21c) for each  $j \in \{1, \dots, 2^{|\mathcal{L}|}\}$  can be reformulated as polyhedral constraints with respect to expected costs  $\bar{\mathbf{c}}_j = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}_j} \{\mathbf{c}\}$ , i.e.,

$$z \geq \max_{\bar{\mathbf{c}}_j \in \mathcal{S}_j} \bar{\mathbf{c}}_j^\top \mathbf{y}_j \tag{22}$$

Note that the maximization problem in the right-hand side of (22) is a linear program. Therefore, by strong duality we have:

$$\max_{\bar{\mathbf{c}}_j \in \mathcal{S}_j} \bar{\mathbf{c}}_j^\top \mathbf{y}_j = \min_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}_j, \mathbf{y}_j} \left\{ \mathbf{b}_j^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}_j : \boldsymbol{\lambda}_j \geq 0, -\mathbf{y}_j + \mathbf{B}_j^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}_j = 0 \right\}$$

This observation and eliminating the minimum in the dual problem yields the following reformulation of  $(\mathbf{F}_{ms})$ :

$$\min_{\mathbf{y}, z} z \tag{23a}$$

$$\text{s.t. non-anticipativity constraints (9),} \tag{23b}$$

$$\left. \begin{aligned} z &\geq \mathbf{b}_j^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}_j \\ -\mathbf{y}_j + \mathbf{B}_j^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}_j &= 0 \\ \boldsymbol{\lambda}_j &\geq 0 \\ \mathbf{y}_j &\in Y \end{aligned} \right\} \quad \forall j \in \{1, \dots, 2^{|\mathcal{L}|}\} \tag{23c}$$

Finally, we linearize the non-anticipativity constraints (9) defined in Proposition 2. In this regard, for any fixed  $j, \ell \in \{1, \dots, 2^{|\mathcal{L}|}\}$ ,  $n \in N_{j,\ell}$  and  $i \in N \setminus N_{j,\ell}$  we introduce new variables  $v_{j,i,n}$  and  $w_{j,i,n}$  such that:

$$v_{j,i,n} = \max\{0; t_{j,i} - t_{j,n}\} \tag{24a}$$

$$w_{j,i,n} = \min\{v_{j,i,n} + 2 - \sum_{a' \in FS_n} y_{j,a'} - \sum_{a' \in FS_i} y_{j,a'}; \sum_{a' \in FS_n} y_{j,a'}\} \tag{24b}$$

The maximum in (24a) can be linearized by introducing new binary variables  $\tilde{v}_{i,j,n} \in \{0, 1\}$  and

the following linear constraints [30]:

$$\begin{aligned}
v_{j,i,n} &\geq 0 \\
v_{j,i,n} &\geq t_{j,i} - t_{j,n} \\
v_{j,i,n} &\leq M_1 \tilde{v}_{i,j,n} \\
v_{j,i,n} &\leq t_{j,i} - t_{j,n} + M_1(1 - \tilde{v}_{j,i,n})
\end{aligned}$$

Specifically, as long as  $|t_{j,i} - t_{j,n}| \leq |N| - 1$ , we set  $M_1 = |N| - 1$ .

Next, the constraint (9d) implies that the sum of  $w_{j,i,n}$  over  $n \in N_{j,\ell}$  is bounded from below. Hence, in order to linearize the minimum in (24b) it is sufficient to enforce that

$$\begin{aligned}
w_{j,i,n} &\leq v_{j,i,n} + 2 - \sum_{a' \in FS_n} y_{j,a'} - \sum_{a' \in FS_i} y_{j,a'} \\
w_{j,i,n} &\leq \sum_{a' \in FS_n} y_{j,a'}
\end{aligned}$$

As a result, the multi-stage DRSP ( $\mathbf{F}_{ms}$ ) can be expressed as a linear MIP problem (19).  $\square$

Theorem 2 addresses the research question **Q3** formulated in Section 1.1. Thus, the multi-stage DRSP ( $\mathbf{F}_{ms}$ ) can be solved at hand by using off-the-shelf MIP solvers even for graphs that contain cycles. In particular, a linear MIP reformulation for acyclic graphs can be derived from (19) by using the non-anticipativity constraints (8) instead of the constraints (19b) and (19c). We point out that, if the number of auxiliary constraints,  $|\mathcal{L}|$ , is fixed, then the number of variables and constraints in (19) is polynomial in the size of the network.

In addition, we observe that the auxiliary constraints (5) refine the initial distributional constraints in  $\mathcal{Q}$  only if the resulting polyhedral uncertainty sets (18) are non-empty. This property can be readily checked by solving the related linear feasibility problems for each polyhedron. Meanwhile, Theorem 2 remains valid even if some polyhedral uncertainty sets are empty. More precisely, if a set  $\mathcal{S}_j$  is empty for some  $j \in \{1, \dots, 2^{|\mathcal{L}|}\}$ , then

$$\min_{\mathbf{y}_j, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_j} \left\{ \mathbf{b}_j^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}_j : \boldsymbol{\lambda}_j \geq 0, -\mathbf{y}_j + \mathbf{B}_j^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}_j = 0 \right\} = -\infty$$

by strong duality and, therefore, the associated constraints (19d) are non-binding.

Finally, Theorem 2 is also applicable to some other user's objective criteria, for which the constraints (21c) admit a linear programming dual reformulation. In view of our results for the one-stage model in [27], the user may potentially optimize the conditional value at risk [32] or some other optimized certainty equivalent risk measures [21, 38]. We leave these extensions as a possible direction of future research.

## 4. Computational experiments

In our computational study we attempt to answer the research questions **Q1** and **Q2** from Section 1.1. Thus, we explore whether it is favorable for the user to employ dynamic decisions. In other words, the role of the auxiliary distributional constraints (5) is analyzed in relation to the quality of dynamic decisions and tractability of the MIP reformulation (19).

Summarizing our discussion in Sections 2.3 and 3.2 we propose the following two-step procedure for validation of our approach. In the first step, we construct the initial ambiguity set  $\mathcal{Q}$  and solve the MIP reformulation (19) to obtain an estimate of the optimal user's decision for every feasible vector of attacker's responses. In the second step, we attempt to identify the actual sequence of attacker's responses by verifying the auxiliary distributional constraints (5) dynamically at the respective nodes of the user's path. As we outlined before, if the user stays at some node  $i \in N \setminus \{f\}$ , then only the attacker's responses associated with node  $i$  can be identified by the user.

From the methodological point, we use data generated from some nominal distribution  $\mathbb{Q}^*$  both to construct the initial ambiguity set  $\mathcal{Q}$  and to verify the auxiliary constraints (5). For convenience we distinguish between the data set used to construct  $\mathcal{Q}$  and the data set (10) used to verify the auxiliary constraints. This splitting of data is rather technical and reflects the fact that the data for the constraint verification procedure is collected in an online manner (and, thus, is not necessarily available at the beginning of the game).

The remainder of this section is organized as follows. In Section 4.1 we introduce some performance metrics to assess the quality of dynamic decisions and the quality of the constraint verification procedure. Section 4.2 describes our construction of test instances including the structure of the network and distributional constraints. Then in Section 4.3 we provide our numerical results both for acyclic and general graphs. All experiments are performed on a PC with *CPU i5-7200U* and *RAM 8 GB*. MIP problems are solved in Java with *CPLEX 20.1*.

### 4.1. Performance metrics

Following Example 1 we observe that the optimal objective function value of the multi-stage problem  $(\mathbf{F}_{ms})$ ,  $z_{dynamic}^*$ , is bounded from below by the optimal objective function value of the max-min problem, i.e.,

$$z_{dynamic}^* \geq z_{lower} := \max_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}} \min_{\mathbf{y} \in Y} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\{\mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{y}\} \quad (\mathbf{G}_1)$$

For this reason, it is rather natural to assess the quality of dynamic decisions by using the relative gap of the form:

$$\rho_1 := 100 \times \frac{z_{static}^* - z_{dynamic}^*}{z_{static}^* - z_{lower}}, \quad (\mathbf{G}_1)$$

where we recall that  $z_{static}^*$  is an optimal objective function value of the one-stage problem  $(\mathbf{F}_{os})$ . In addition, using the proof of Theorem 1 it is easy to show that the max-min problem in the

right hand side of (25) admits a *linear programming* reformulation. The following result holds.

**Proposition 4.** *For each  $i \in N$  and  $j \in A$  let*

$$g_i = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } i = s \\ -1, & \text{if } i = f \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \text{and } G_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } j \in RS_i \\ -1, & \text{if } j \in FS_i \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

*Then the max-min problem*

$$\max_{\mathbf{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}} \min_{\mathbf{y} \in Y} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Q}} \{ \mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{y} \}$$

*is equivalent to a linear programming problem of the form:*

$$\begin{aligned} z_{lower} &= \max_{\bar{\mathbf{c}}, \boldsymbol{\mu}} \mathbf{g}^\top \boldsymbol{\mu} \\ \text{s.t. } &\bar{\mathbf{c}} - \mathbf{G}^\top \boldsymbol{\mu} \geq \mathbf{0} \\ &\mathbf{B}_0 \bar{\mathbf{c}} \leq \mathbf{b}_0 \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

The relative gap  $\rho_1 \in [0, 100]$  quantifies the user's profit (in percentages) obtained from using dynamic decisions (in relation to the static problem formulation). For instance, in Example 1 we have  $z_{static}^* = 1$  and  $z_{lower} = 0.25$ . At the same time, it is rather straightforward to verify that  $z_{dynamic}^* \geq 0.5$  irrespective of the auxiliary distributional constraints observed by the user. Hence, in this example  $\rho_1 \leq 50\%$  and the value of 100% is not always achievable.

In addition, we note that the worst-case expected loss  $z_{dynamic}^*$  can be potentially improved by leveraging the constraint verification procedure from Section 2.3. More specifically, by solving the multi-stage problem  $(\mathbf{F}_{ms})$  we obtain a set of optimal decisions, say,

$$\mathbf{y}_1^*, \dots, \mathbf{y}_{2^{|\mathcal{L}|}}^* \in Y$$

for every feasible sequence of attacker's responses. After that, the auxiliary constraints (5) are verified dynamically while the user traverses between the source and the destination nodes. In other words, by verifying the auxiliary constraints (5) the user identifies a unique decision  $\tilde{\mathbf{y}} \in \{\mathbf{y}_1^*, \dots, \mathbf{y}_{2^{|\mathcal{L}|}}^*\}$  and the associated ambiguity set  $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}} \in \{\mathcal{Q}_1, \dots, \mathcal{Q}_{2^{|\mathcal{L}|}}\}$ .

For simplicity of exposition the quality of the constraint verification procedure is defined as:

$$\rho_2 := 100 \times \frac{z_{dynamic}^* - \tilde{z}_{dynamic}}{z_{static}^* - z_{lower}}, \tag{\mathbf{G}_2}$$

where  $\tilde{z}_{dynamic}$  is our estimate of the worst-case expected loss *after* the constraint verification procedure. More precisely,  $\tilde{z}_{dynamic}$  can be computed by solving the following linear program-




Figure 4: An acyclic (4a) and general (4b) layered graphs with  $h = 2$  intermediate layers and  $r = 2$  nodes at each layer. The source and destination nodes are given by  $s = 1$  and  $f = 6$ , respectively.

ming problem:

$$\tilde{z}_{dynamic} := \max_{\mathbb{Q} \in \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}} \{ \mathbf{c}^{\top} \tilde{\mathbf{y}} \} = \max_{\bar{\mathbf{c}} \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}} \{ \bar{\mathbf{c}}^{\top} \tilde{\mathbf{y}} \},$$

where  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$  is a polyhedral uncertainty set corresponding to the ambiguity set  $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}$ ; recall Theorem 1.

We observe that the sum  $\rho_1 + \rho_2$  characterizes the total value (in percentages) by which the difference  $z_{static}^* - z_{lower}$  can be reduced by leveraging the constraint verification procedure. Furthermore, both relative gaps  $(\mathbf{G}_1)$  and  $(\mathbf{G}_2)$  can be readily computed by the user without complete knowledge of the nominal distribution  $\mathbb{Q}^*$ . However, as a potential drawback, it may be the case that  $\tilde{z}_{dynamic} < z_{lower}$  as some additional information about the nominal distribution  $\mathbb{Q}^*$  is available to the user. Therefore,  $\rho_2$  is nonnegative, but the actual upper bound is not well-defined.

#### 4.2. Test instances

**Classes of graphs.** We consider two classes of fully connected layered graphs that are either acyclic or contain directed cycles. An acyclic layered graph is assumed to contain  $h \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  intermediate layers and  $r \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  nodes at each layer. The first and the last layer consist of unique nodes, which are the source and the destination nodes, respectively. For example, a network with  $h = 2$  and  $r = 2$  is depicted in Figure 4a.

As a second class, we consider the abovementioned layered graphs but with some additional arcs in the reversed direction. More precisely, we assume that the arcs not adjacent to  $s$  and  $f$  can be traversed in both directions; see Figure 4b.

**Nominal distribution and initial ambiguity set.** With respect to the nominal marginal distributions  $\mathbb{Q}_a^*$ ,  $a \in A$ , we assume that the arc costs  $c_a$  are governed by the standard beta distribution with parameters  $\alpha_a, \beta_a \in \mathbb{R}_+$  and the support given by  $[0, 1]$ . The nominal marginal distributions  $\mathbb{Q}_{(i,j)}^*$  and  $\mathbb{Q}_{(j,i)}^*$  are assumed to be *the same* for any  $(i, j) \in A$ . Then the nominal

distribution  $\mathbb{Q}^*$  is defined as a product of the marginal distributions  $\mathbb{Q}_a^*$ ,  $a \in A$ .

If  $m_a$  and  $\sigma_a$ ,  $a \in A$ , denote the mean and the standard deviation of  $c_a$ , respectively, then

$$\alpha_a = \frac{m_a^2(1 - m_a)}{\sigma_a^2} - m_a, \quad \beta_a = \alpha_a \left( \frac{1}{m_a} - 1 \right), \quad (27)$$

see, e.g., [19]. In particular, for each  $a = (i, j) \in A$ ,  $i < j$ , we set  $\sigma_a = 0.125$ , and select  $m_a$  uniformly at random from the interval

$$\left( \frac{1}{2}(1 - \sqrt{1 - 4\sigma_a^2}), \frac{1}{2}(1 + \sqrt{1 - 4\sigma_a^2}) \right),$$

The latter condition guarantees that a beta distribution defined by (27) exists, i.e.,  $\alpha_a, \beta_a > 0$ .

Next, the initial ambiguity set  $\mathcal{Q}$  is constructed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q} = \left\{ \mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}_0(\mathbb{R}^{|A|}) : \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}} \left\{ \sum_{a \in FS_i \cup RS_i} c_a - \sum_{\{(i,j): (i,j) \in FS_i, (j,i) \in RS_i\}} c_{(i,j)} \right\} \leq \Gamma_i \quad \forall i \in N, \right. \\ \left. \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}} \{c_{(i,j)} - c_{(j,i)}\} = 0 \quad \forall (i,j) \in A, \mathbb{Q}_a \{c_a \in [0, 1]\} = 1 \quad \forall a \in A \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Specifically, the linear expectation constraints with respect to  $a \in FS_i \cup RS_i$  can be seen as an attacker's budget allocated at node  $i$ . If the graph is general, i.e.,

$$\sum_{\{(i,j): (i,j) \in FS_i, (j,i) \in RS_i\}} c_{(i,j)} \neq 0$$

for some  $i \in N$ , then we account each arc  $a \in FS_i \cup RS_i$  only once. The second constraints in (28) indicate that the expected costs of  $(i, j) \in A$  and  $(j, i) \in A$  are the same; these constraints follow the definition of  $\mathbb{Q}^*$  and are assumed to be satisfied by construction. Finally, the last constraints in (28) are the support constraints.

We define the parameters  $\Gamma_i$ ,  $i \in N$ , in (28) using a data set

$$\tilde{\mathbf{C}} = \left\{ (\tilde{c}_1^{(k)}, \dots, \tilde{c}_{|A|}^{(k)})^\top, k \in \{1, \dots, \tilde{n}\} \right\}$$

obtained from the nominal distribution  $\mathbb{Q}^*$ ; recall that we distinguish between this data set and the data set (10) used for the constraint verification procedure. Then the parameters  $\Gamma_i$ ,  $i \in N$ , are derived from Hoeffding inequality (14) with any given confidence level  $\eta_i \in (0, 1)$ . Also, we use Bonferroni's inequality [7] to provide a required confidence level  $\eta \in (0, 1)$  for the ambiguity set  $\mathcal{Q}$ , i.e., we set  $\eta_i = 1 - \frac{1-\eta}{|N|}$ . For convenience, we report the notations used in our test instances in Table 1.

Admittedly, our construction of  $\mathcal{Q}$  is somewhat stylized and not without limitations. However in Section 4.3 it is verified numerically that  $z_{static}^* \neq z_{lower}$  in all generated test instances

Parameter	Definition
$h \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$	a number of intermediate layers in the graph
$r \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$	a number of nodes at each layer
$\kappa \in (0, 1)$	a probability that a sensor is placed at each node
$\tilde{n} \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$	a number of samples in the data set $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}$
$\hat{n} \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$	a number of samples in the data set $\hat{\mathbf{C}}$
$\eta_i = 1 - \frac{1-\eta}{ N }, i \in N$	confidence levels for the linear expectation constraints
$\eta \in (0, 1)$	a confidence level for the initial ambiguity set (28)
$\gamma \in (0, 1)$	a confidence level for each auxiliary constraint

Table 1: Summary of the notation used in the construction of test instances.

(otherwise, there is no need to apply our multi-stage problem formulation.) Also, we do not consider some more involved ambiguity sets as our focus is on the role of the auxiliary distributional constraints (5).

**Auxiliary constraints.** For simplicity, we suppose that the auxiliary constraints are restricted by the linear expectation constraints of the form (5b); some additional results that account the auxiliary constraints (5a) are relegated to Appendix A. We recall that by Theorem 1 the probability constraints (5a) can be also seen as some individual expectation constraints. However the difference between (5a) and (5b) lies in the form of resulting expectation constraints and the data used to verify these constraints; we refer to our discussion in Section 2.3 and Appendix A.

The constraints (5b) are constructed using sensors as it is proposed in Example 2. That is, each node  $i \in N$  is assumed to be equipped with a sensor with some fixed probability  $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ ; see, e.g., Figure 5. We additionally assume that the constraints (5b) are associated only with the arcs  $(i, j) \in A$  such that  $i < j$ . Following Example 2 we suggest three types of the auxiliary expectation constraints given by:

- *individual constraints* corresponding to the adjacent sensors, e.g., constraints for the expected cost of (1, 2), (2, 4) and (2, 5) in Figure 5.
- *difference constraints*, e.g., constraints with respect to the difference of expected costs of (3, 4) and (3, 5) in Figure 5.
- *sum constraints*, e.g., constraints with respect to the sum of expected costs of (3, 4) and (3, 5) in Figure 5 (we use these constraints, if at least one of the arcs can be traversed in both directions.)

Formally, a constraint of the form (5b) related to some node  $i \in N \setminus \{f\}$  can be defined as:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}} \left\{ \sum_{a \in FS_i} p_a c_a \right\} = \sum_{a \in FS_i} p_a \bar{c}_a \leq p_0, \quad (29)$$




Figure 5: An example of random sensors allocation for a layered graph with  $h = r = 2$ . The sensors are highlighted in blue.

where  $\bar{c}_a = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}_a}\{c_a\}$ , the coefficients  $p_a \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$  depend on the type of this constraint and the threshold  $p_0 \in \mathbb{R}$  is, e.g., given by:

$$p_0 := \frac{1}{2} \left( \min_{\bar{c} \in \mathcal{S}_0} \sum_{a \in FS_i} p_a \bar{c}_a + \max_{\bar{c} \in \mathcal{S}_0} \sum_{a \in FS_i} p_a \bar{c}_a \right),$$

We collect a required number of the auxiliary constraints by selecting a random node and a random constraint associated with this node. If the above procedure does not allow to construct the required number of constraints, then the sensors allocation is updated.

As outlined earlier, we generate a new data set

$$\widehat{\mathbf{C}} := \left\{ (\hat{c}_1^{(k)}, \dots, \hat{c}_{|A|}^{(k)})^\top, k \in \{1, \dots, \hat{n}\} \right\},$$

for the constraint verification procedure; recall equation (10). Then the auxiliary constraints are verified via Hoeffding inequality (14) with some fixed confidence level  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  (which is assumed to be the same for all auxiliary constraints). As outlined before, in order to verify a constraint of the form (29) related to some node  $i \in N \setminus \{f\}$ , we use only random samples (or their linear combinations) associated with the arcs  $a \in FS_i$ . If the user fails to verify some auxiliary constraint using  $\hat{n}$  samples, then this constraint is verified by force as follows:

- if the constraint is an individual or a sum constraint, then it is assumed to be violated (it models the worst-case scenario for the user);
- if the constraint is a difference constraint, then it is assumed to be satisfied with probability 0.5.

Summarizing the discussion above, we expect that for some fixed confidence level  $\gamma$  the quality of the constraint verification procedure,  $(\mathbf{G}_2)$ , increases with the increase of  $\hat{n}$ .

Number of constraints	Acyclic graphs		
	$\rho_1$ (MAD) in %	$\rho_2$ (MAD) in %	average time (MAD) in sec.
$ \mathcal{L}  = 1$	2.0 (3.5)	1.5 (2.8)	0.04 (0.02)
$ \mathcal{L}  = 2$	4.8 (7.2)	5.8 (9.1)	0.07 (0.02)
$ \mathcal{L}  = 3$	6.3 (8.9)	8.3 (11.7)	0.17 (0.07)
$ \mathcal{L}  = 4$	8.3 (10.0)	11.3 (14.1)	0.67 (0.33)
$ \mathcal{L}  = 5$	10.2 (11.6)	12.2 (15.2)	3.8 (2.85)

Table 2: Let  $h = r = 3$ ,  $\hat{n} = \tilde{n} = 60$  and assume that the graph is acyclic. We report the average relative gaps ( $\mathbf{G}_1$ ) and ( $\mathbf{G}_2$ ) and the average running times in seconds with mean absolute deviations (in brackets) over 50 random test instances.

Number of constraints	General graphs		
	$\rho_1$ (MAD) in %	$\rho_2$ (MAD) in %	average time (MAD) in sec.
$ \mathcal{L}  = 1$	1.8 (3.2)	3.3 (5.9)	0.08 (0.05)
$ \mathcal{L}  = 2$	3.6 (6.0)	4.4 (7.3)	0.28 (0.10)
$ \mathcal{L}  = 3$	4.9 (7.1)	9.1 (13.1)	10.1 (6.71)
$ \mathcal{L}  = 4$	-	-	> 600
$ \mathcal{L}  = 5$	-	-	> 600

Table 3: Let  $h = r = 3$ ,  $\hat{n} = \tilde{n} = 60$  and assume that the graph is general. We report the average relative gaps ( $\mathbf{G}_1$ ) and ( $\mathbf{G}_2$ ) and the average running times in seconds with mean absolute deviations (in brackets) over 50 random test instances.

### 4.3. Results for different network types

In the numerical experiments we explore how the quality of adaptive decisions scales in the number of auxiliary constraints, the size of the network and the sample sizes,  $\hat{n}$  and  $\tilde{n}$ ; recall Table 1. In particular, for different parameter settings we compute the average relative gaps ( $\mathbf{G}_1$ ) and ( $\mathbf{G}_2$ ) and the average running time with mean absolute deviations across 50 test instances. Also, in all experiments we set  $\eta = 0.95$ ,  $\gamma = 0.95$  and  $\kappa = 0.5$ .

**Dependence on the number of auxiliary constraints.** Let  $h = r = 3$  and  $\hat{n} = \tilde{n} = 60$ ; recall our notations in Table 1. For each test instance we increase the number of the auxiliary constraints,  $|\mathcal{L}|$ , from 1 to 5. The results are reported, respectively, in Tables 2 and 3.

First, we observe that both performance metrics ( $\mathbf{G}_1$ ), ( $\mathbf{G}_2$ ) and the solution times increase in the number of the auxiliary expectation constraints. In fact, augmenting the set of constraints provides more information for the user and, thus, improves the quality of both adaptive decisions and the constraint verification procedure. For example, for  $|\mathcal{L}| = 5$  and the acyclic graphs the total profit  $\rho_1 + \rho_2$  obtained by the user is about 22% on average. Also, the relative gaps ( $\mathbf{G}_1$ ) and ( $\mathbf{G}_2$ ) are of the same order for the acyclic and general graphs; see Tables 2 and 3 for fixed  $|\mathcal{L}|$ . The latter observation can be explained by a similar construction of test instances for acyclic and general graphs, respectively.

As expected, the multi-stage problem ( $\mathbf{F}_{ms}$ ) becomes more computationally complex for

# samples in $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}$	# samples in $\hat{\mathbf{C}}$	Acyclic graphs		
		$\rho_1$ (MAD) in %	$\rho_2$ (MAD) in %	average time (MAD) in sec
$\tilde{n} = 20$	$\hat{n} = 60$	2.0 (3.6)	22.7 (29.1)	2.49 (1.80)
$\tilde{n} = 40$		7.9 (9.7)	16.3 (18.5)	3.43 (2.46)
$\tilde{n} = 60$		10.2 (11.6)	12.2 (15.2)	3.8 (2.85)
$\tilde{n} = 80$		11.6 (11.8)	9.5 (11.9)	5.45 (5.11)
$\tilde{n} = 100$		12.2 (11.6)	12.2 (13.2)	3.89 (2.95)
$\tilde{n} = 60$	$\hat{n} = 20$	10.2 (11.6)	9.9 (12.8)	3.8 (2.85)
	$\hat{n} = 40$		11.4 (14.9)	
	$\hat{n} = 60$		12.2 (15.2)	
	$\hat{n} = 80$		13.1 (15.6)	
	$\hat{n} = 100$		13.2 (16.3)	

Table 4: Let  $h = r = 3$ ,  $|\mathcal{L}| = 5$  and assume that the graph is acyclic. We report the average relative gaps ( $\mathbf{G}_1$ ) and ( $\mathbf{G}_2$ ) and the average running times in seconds with mean absolute deviations (in brackets) over 50 random test instances.

general graphs and with the increase of  $|\mathcal{L}|$ ; recall the form of non-anticipativity constraints (8) and (9). We also recall that the number of feasible attacker’s responses is exponential in  $|\mathcal{L}|$ , which yields that the number of variables and constraints in the MIP reformulation (19) increases exponentially with the increase of  $|\mathcal{L}|$ . As a result, even for graphs of a moderate size we may handle only problems with a relatively small number of auxiliary constraints.

**Dependence on the sample size.** In this experiment we consider acyclic graphs and explore how the quality of dynamic decisions and solution times depend on the sample sizes  $\hat{n}$  and  $\tilde{n}$ ; recall Table 1. In particular, let  $h = r = 3$  and  $|\mathcal{L}| = 5$ . For each test instance and different values of  $\hat{n}$  and  $\tilde{n}$  we preserve the same nominal distribution  $\mathbb{Q}^*$  and fix a particular placement of sensors. The results are reported in Table 4.

We observe that ( $\mathbf{G}_1$ ) and ( $\mathbf{G}_2$ ) tend to increase and decrease, respectively, as functions of  $\tilde{n}$ . In fact, with the increase of  $\tilde{n}$  the user may obtain less conservative estimates of the budget parameters  $\Gamma_i$ ,  $i \in N$ , in the ambiguity set (28). It can be also argued that, if these budget parameters are sufficiently large for each  $i \in N$ , then the related expectation constraints in (28) are potentially redundant and  $z_{static}^* \approx z_{lower}$ . Our hypothesis is that the smaller the difference  $z_{static}^* - z_{lower}$ , the more difficult it is for the user to improve its worst-case expected loss by leveraging the multi-stage formulation ( $\mathbf{F}_{ms}$ ). At the same time, we observe that the constraint verification procedure allows to compensate these losses. That is, the total profit received by the user,  $\rho_1 + \rho_2$ , is approximately constant in  $\tilde{n}$  and averages about 23%; see the first part of Table 4.

Next, we note that the quality of the constraint verification procedure increases with the increase of the number of additional samples,  $\hat{n}$ ; see the second part of Table 4. This fact seems to be rather intuitive as for sufficiently large  $\hat{n}$  the user may verify more constraints correctly

# layers	# nodes at each layer	Acyclic graphs		
		$\rho_1$ (MAD) in %	$\rho_2$ (MAD) in %	average time (MAD) in sec
$h = 2$		22.0 (19.8)	19.5 (24.3)	0.42 (0.21)
$h = 3$	$r = 3$	10.2 (11.6)	12.2 (15.2)	3.8 (2.85)
$h = 4$		7.6 (9.3)	8.6 (11.5)	34.46 (30.34)
	$r = 2$	19.8 (16.3)	34.1 (26.2)	0.19 (0.05)
$h = 3$	$r = 3$	10.2 (11.6)	12.2 (15.2)	3.8 (2.85)
	$r = 4$	3.3 (5.7)	11.6 (15.9)	44.13 (47,27)

Table 5: Let  $|\mathcal{L}| = 5$ ,  $\hat{n} = \tilde{n} = 60$  and assume that the graph is acyclic. We report the average relative gaps ( $\mathbf{G}_1$ ) and ( $\mathbf{G}_2$ ) and the average running times in seconds with mean absolute deviations (in brackets) over 50 random test instances.

# layers	# nodes at each layer	General graphs		
		$\rho_1$ (MAD) in %	$\rho_2$ (MAD) in %	average time (MAD) in sec
$h = 2$		16.6 (18.2)	10.4 (15.6)	0.72 (0.27)
$h = 3$	$r = 3$	4.9 (7.1)	9.1 (13.1)	10.1 (6.71)
$h = 4$		2.5 (4.2)	0.9 (1.7)	99.62 (88.53)
	$r = 2$	16.0 (16.9)	9.9 (13.7)	0.47 (0.12)
$h = 3$	$r = 3$	4.9 (7.1)	9.1 (13.1)	10.1 (6.71)
	$r = 4$	1.1 (2.1)	1.7 (3.1)	64.54 (43.12)

Table 6: Let  $|\mathcal{L}| = 3$ ,  $\hat{n} = \tilde{n} = 60$  and assume that the graph is general. We report the average relative gaps ( $\mathbf{G}_1$ ) and ( $\mathbf{G}_2$ ) and the average running times in seconds with mean absolute deviations (in brackets) over 50 random test instances.

(with the confidence level  $\gamma = 0.95$ ) and, thus, better identify the nominal distribution  $\mathbb{Q}^*$ . Finally, we point out that the solution times for the MIP formulation (19) do not depend on  $\hat{n}$  by construction and slightly depend on  $\tilde{n}$ ; see the last column of Table 4.

**Dependence on the size of the network.** In our last numerical experiment we examine how the relative gaps ( $\mathbf{G}_1$ ) and ( $\mathbf{G}_2$ ) and the solution times scale in the size of the network. Let  $\hat{n} = \tilde{n} = 60$  and assume that  $|\mathcal{L}| = 5$  and  $|\mathcal{L}| = 3$  for the acyclic and general graphs, respectively. For each class of graphs we test different values of  $h$  and  $r$ , that is,  $h \in \{2, 3, 4\}$  and  $r \in \{2, 3, 4\}$ . The results are reported in Tables 5 and 6.

Naturally, the solution times increase in both  $h$  and  $r$ , while the average relative gaps ( $\mathbf{G}_1$ ) and ( $\mathbf{G}_2$ ) tend to decrease. The intuition behind these results is that the size of the MIP reformulation (19) increases as a function of  $h$  and  $r$ , while the role of each particular constraint in  $\mathcal{L}$  becomes less pronounced for networks of a larger size.

Another interesting observation is that the average relative gap ( $\mathbf{G}_1$ ) tends to zero faster with the increase of  $r$  rather than  $h$ . In this regard, we recall that the auxiliary distributional constraints are, in fact, associated with random nodes in the network. Hence, if the number of auxiliary constraints,  $|\mathcal{L}|$ , is fixed, then the larger  $r$ , the less constraints are potentially met by the user while traversing through the network. Meanwhile, the increase of the number of

layers,  $h$ , does not result in such a scattering of the auxiliary constraints among different paths.

**Summary.** In our computational experiments we attempt to address the research questions **Q1** and **Q2** described in Section 1.1. It turns out that the user may often gain some profit by leveraging dynamic decisions instead of the static ones. However the magnitude of this profit depends on the size of the graph, the form of initial ambiguity set as well as the parameters of the constraint verification procedure. Admittedly, the primary application of our approach is to the networks of a relatively small size, in which solutions with a sufficiently high quality can be derived within a reasonable time. It can be also argued that most of existing solution approaches to multi-stage problems with binary recourse decisions can only be applied to instances of a moderate size; see, e.g., the studies in [4, 5, 31] and the references therein.

## 5. Conclusion

In this paper we consider a dynamic version of the shortest path problem, where the cost vector is subject to distributional uncertainty. We formulate the problem in terms of an ambiguity-averse multi-stage network game between a user and an attacker. The user aims at minimizing its cumulative expected loss by traversing between two fixed nodes in the network, while the attacker maximizes the user’s objective by selecting a distribution of arc costs from an ambiguity set of candidate distributions. In contrast to the one-stage formulation, both the user and the attacker are able to adjust their decisions at each node of the user’s path.

Following the related one-stage formulation we suppose that the overall family of probability distributions is formed by individual probability constraints for particular arcs and linear expectation constraints for prescribed subsets of arcs. Also, while traversing through the network, the user may verify some auxiliary distributional constraints associated with the arcs emanated from the current user’s position. Specifically, we assume that the user forms a list of auxiliary distributional constraints at the beginning of the game, whereas the attacker forms a list of responses that are consistently revealed to the user.

We design two classes of non-anticipativity constraints (for acyclic and general graphs, respectively) enforcing that the user’s decision at some particular node cannot depend on future attacker’s responses. Furthermore, by using some properties of the related one-stage formulation and linear programming duality the multi-stage problem is reformulated as a one potentially large linear mixed-integer programming problem.

From the application perspective, we illustrate that the auxiliary distributional constraints can be constructed and verified by using some information from Bluetooth sensors. Finally, we conduct a numerical study where the one- and multi-stage problem formulations are compared on several classes of synthetic network instances. It turns out that using adaptive decisions is practically relevant only for networks of a relatively small size, in which high quality adaptive decisions can be obtained within a reasonable time.

With respect to future research directions, it would be interesting to explore some other types of objective criteria and ambiguity sets; see, e.g., [21]. At the same time, it can be argued that another types of ambiguity sets imply the need for more advanced solution techniques as our partitions of the initial ambiguity set are based on some linearity properties of the auxiliary distributional constraints.

**Acknowledgments.** The author would like to thank Dr. Oleg Prokopyev for his helpful comments and suggestions. The article was prepared within the framework of the Basic Research Program at the National Research University Higher School of Economics (Sections 1-2). The research is funded by RSF grant №22-11-00073 (Sections 3-5).

## References

- [1] Ahuja, R. K., Magnanti, T. L., and Orlin, J. B. (1988). *Network flows*. Cambridge, Mass.: Alfred P. Sloan School of Management, Massachusetts.
- [2] Asudegi, M. and Haghani, A. (2013). Optimal number and location of node-based sensors for collection of travel time data in networks. *Transportation Research Record*, 2338(1):35–43.
- [3] Bayraksan, G. and Love, D. K. (2015). Data-driven stochastic programming using phi-divergences. In *The Operations Research Revolution*, pages 1–19. INFORMS.
- [4] Bertsimas, D. and Dunning, I. (2016). Multistage robust mixed-integer optimization with adaptive partitions. *Operations Research*, 64(4):980–998.
- [5] Bertsimas, D. and Georghiou, A. (2015). Design of near optimal decision rules in multistage adaptive mixed-integer optimization. *Operations Research*, 63(3):610–627.
- [6] Bertsimas, D., Sim, M., and Zhang, M. (2018). Adaptive distributionally robust optimization. *Management Science*, 65(2):604–618.
- [7] Birge, J. R. and Louveaux, F. (2011). *Introduction to stochastic programming*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- [8] Borrero, J. S., Prokopyev, O. A., and Sauré, D. (2015). Sequential shortest path interdiction with incomplete information. *Decision Analysis*, 13(1):68–98.
- [9] Borrero, J. S., Prokopyev, O. A., and Sauré, D. (2019). Sequential interdiction with incomplete information and learning. *Operations Research*, 67(1):72–89.
- [10] Bubeck, S., Cesa-Bianchi, N., and Kakade, S. M. (2012). Towards minimax policies for online linear optimization with bandit feedback. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 41–1.

- [11] Buchheim, C. and Kurtz, J. (2018). Robust combinatorial optimization under convex and discrete cost uncertainty. *EURO Journal on Computational Optimization*, 6(3):211–238.
- [12] Chang, G.-L., Park, S. Y., and Paracha, J. (2011). Intelligent transportation system field demonstration: integration of variable speed limit control and travel time estimation for a recurrently congested highway. *Transportation Research Record*, 2243(1):55–66.
- [13] Cormen, T. H., Leiserson, C. E., Rivest, R. L., and Stein, C. (2009). *Introduction to algorithms*. MIT press.
- [14] Delage, E. and Ye, Y. (2010). Distributionally robust optimization under moment uncertainty with application to data-driven problems. *Operations Research*, 58(3):595–612.
- [15] Duque, D. and Morton, D. P. (2020). Distributionally robust stochastic dual dynamic programming. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 30(4):2841–2865.
- [16] Dyer, M. and Stougie, L. (2006). Computational complexity of stochastic programming problems. *Mathematical Programming*, 106(3):423–432.
- [17] Esfahani, P. M. and Kuhn, D. (2018). Data-driven distributionally robust optimization using the wasserstein metric: Performance guarantees and tractable reformulations. *Mathematical Programming*, 171(1-2):115–166.
- [18] Goh, J. and Sim, M. (2010). Distributionally robust optimization and its tractable approximations. *Operations Research*, 58(4-part-1):902–917.
- [19] Gupta, A. K. and Nadarajah, S. (2004). *Handbook of beta distribution and its applications*. CRC press.
- [20] Haghani, A., Hamed, M., Sadabadi, K. F., Young, S., and Tarnoff, P. (2010). Data collection of freeway travel time ground truth with bluetooth sensors. *Transportation Research Record*, 2160(1):60–68.
- [21] Hanasusanto, G. A., Kuhn, D., and Wiesemann, W. (2016). K-adaptability in two-stage distributionally robust binary programming. *Operations Research Letters*, 44(1):6–11.
- [22] Hoeffding, W. (1994). Probability inequalities for sums of bounded random variables. In *The collected works of Wassily Hoeffding*, pages 409–426. Springer.
- [23] Huang, R., Qu, S., Yang, X., and Liu, Z. (2021). Multi-stage distributionally robust optimization with risk aversion. *Journal of Industrial & Management Optimization*, 17(1):233.

- [24] Isii, K. (1962). On sharpness of Tchebycheff-type inequalities. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics*, 14(1):185–197.
- [25] Jiang, R. and Guan, Y. (2018). Risk-averse two-stage stochastic program with distributional ambiguity. *Operations Research*, 66(5):1390–1405.
- [26] Ketkov, S. S. and Prokopyev, O. A. (2020). On greedy and strategic evaders in sequential interdiction settings with incomplete information. *Omega*, 92:102161.
- [27] Ketkov, S. S., Prokopyev, O. A., and Burashnikov, E. P. (2021). An approach to the distributionally robust shortest path problem. *Computers & Operations Research*, 130:105212.
- [28] Kreinovich, V., Xiang, G., Starks, S. A., Longpré, L., Ceberio, M., Araiza, R., Beck, J., Kandathi, R., Nayak, A., Torres, R., et al. (2006). Towards combining probabilistic and interval uncertainty in engineering calculations: algorithms for computing statistics under interval uncertainty, and their computational complexity. *Reliable Computing*, 12(6):471–501.
- [29] Miller, C. E., Tucker, A. W., and Zemlin, R. A. (1960). Integer programming formulation of traveling salesman problems. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 7(4):326–329.
- [30] Nemhauser, G. L. and Wolsey, L. A. (1988). *Integer programming and combinatorial optimization*, volume 191. Springer.
- [31] Postek, K. and Hertog, D. d. (2016). Multistage adjustable robust mixed-integer optimization via iterative splitting of the uncertainty set. *INFORMS Journal on Computing*, 28(3):553–574.
- [32] Rockafellar, R. T., Uryasev, S., et al. (2000). Optimization of conditional value-at-risk. *Journal of Risk*, 2:21–42.
- [33] Romeijnnders, W. and Postek, K. (2021). Piecewise constant decision rules via branch-and-bound based scenario detection for integer adjustable robust optimization. *INFORMS Journal on Computing*, 33(1):390–400.
- [34] Sefair, J. A. and Smith, J. C. (2016). Dynamic shortest-path interdiction. *Networks*, 68(4):315–330.
- [35] Shapiro, A. (2001). On duality theory of conic linear problems. In *Semi-infinite Programming*, pages 135–165. Springer.
- [36] Taccari, L. (2016). Integer programming formulations for the elementary shortest path problem. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 252(1):122–130.

- [37] Vo, T. (2011). *An investigation of bluetooth technology for measuring travel times on arterial roads: a case study on spring street*. PhD thesis, Georgia Institute of Technology.
- [38] Wiesemann, W., Kuhn, D., and Sim, M. (2014). Distributionally robust convex optimization. *Operations Research*, 62(6):1358–1376.
- [39] Xu, H. and Mannor, S. (2010). Distributionally robust markov decision processes. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 2505–2513.
- [40] Yu, X. and Shen, S. (2020). Multistage distributionally robust mixed-integer programming with decision-dependent moment-based ambiguity sets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.12518*.
- [41] Zou, J., Ahmed, S., and Sun, X. A. (2019). Stochastic dual dynamic integer programming. *Mathematical Programming*, 175(1-2):461–502.

## Appendix A. Supplementary material

In this appendix we consider the ambiguity set (28) with the auxiliary probability constraints of the form:

$$\mathbb{Q}_a\{c_a \in [0.5, 1]\} \leq \tilde{q}_a \tag{A.1}$$

with  $\tilde{q}_a = \tilde{q}$  for each  $a \in A$ ; recall Section 2.3. As before, we assume that each node  $i \in N$  is equipped with a sensor with probability  $\kappa = 0.5$  and the constraints (A.1) correspond to the arcs  $a \in A$  with the adjacent sensors. In all experiments we set  $h = r = 3$ ,  $\hat{n} = \tilde{n} = 60$ ,  $\alpha = \gamma = 0.95$  and assume that the graph is acyclic; recall Table 1.

For the first experiment we set  $\tilde{q} = 0.5$  and consider the relative gaps  $(\mathbf{G}_1)$  and  $(\mathbf{G}_2)$  as well as the running time for solving the MIP reformulation (19) as a function of  $|\mathcal{L}|$ . The results are reported in Table A.7.

Comparing the obtained results in Tables 2 and A.7 we observe that the quality of adaptive solutions decreases whenever the probability constraints (5a) are used instead of the expectation constraints (5b). Some intuition behind this fact can be explained as follows. If the constraint (A.1) is satisfied, then the expected cost of  $c_a$  is such that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}_a}\{c_a\} \leq 0.5 \times (1 - \tilde{q}) + 1 \times \tilde{q} = 0.5 \tilde{q} + 0.5 \tag{A.2}$$

Otherwise, if (A.1) is violated, then

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}_a}\{c_a\} \geq 0 \times (1 - \tilde{q}) + 0.5 \times \tilde{q} = 0.5 \tilde{q} \tag{A.3}$$

Hence, there exists some gap between the upper and lower bounds induced by (A.2) and (A.3), respectively. This observation implies that the user receives less information in terms of the

Number of constraints	Acyclic graphs		
	$\rho_1$ (MAD) in %	$\rho_2$ (MAD) in %	average time (MAD) in sec.
$ \mathcal{L}  = 1$	1.1 (2.1)	1.8 (3.1)	0.03 (0.01)
$ \mathcal{L}  = 2$	1.7 (2.9)	6.3 (8.8)	0.06 (0.02)
$ \mathcal{L}  = 3$	2.0 (3.4)	10.2 (10.7)	0.18 (0.07)
$ \mathcal{L}  = 4$	2.4 (3.9)	12.0 (11.7)	0.69 (0.38)
$ \mathcal{L}  = 5$	2.9 (4.4)	13.6 (12.9)	4.03 (3.05)

Table A.7: Let  $h = r = 3$ ,  $\hat{n} = \tilde{n} = 60$ ,  $\bar{q} = 0.5$  and assume that the graph is acyclic. We report the average relative gaps ( $\mathbf{G}_1$ ) and ( $\mathbf{G}_2$ ) and the average running times in seconds with mean absolute deviations (in brackets) over 50 random test instances.

Parameter $\tilde{q}$	Acyclic graphs		
	$\rho_1$ (MAD) in %	$\rho_2$ (MAD) in %	average time (MAD) in sec.
$\tilde{q} = 0.1$	0.5 (0.9)	0.2 (0.3)	3.06 (1.98)
$\tilde{q} = 0.3$	1.6 (2.6)	15.8 (16.1)	4.62 (3.89)
$\tilde{q} = 0.5$	2.9 (4.4)	13.6 (12.9)	4.03 (3.05)
$\tilde{q} = 0.7$	3.4 (4.4)	8.3 (8.0)	4.78 (4.16)
$\tilde{q} = 0.9$	1.5 (1.8)	2.7 (3.4)	4.84 (3.85)

Table A.8: Let  $h = r = 3$ ,  $\hat{n} = \tilde{n} = 60$ ,  $|\mathcal{L}| = 5$  and assume that the graph is acyclic. We report the average relative gaps ( $\mathbf{G}_1$ ) and ( $\mathbf{G}_2$ ) and the average running times in seconds with mean absolute deviations (in brackets) over 50 random test instances.

expected costs by using a probability constraint of the form (A.1) instead of an individual expectation constraint. Despite this fact we recall that the constraints (A.1) may handle interval-censored observations, which is not the case for the auxiliary expectation constraints (29).

In the second experiment we set  $|\mathcal{L}| = 5$  and explore how the quality of adaptive decisions scales in the parameter  $\tilde{q}$  of the auxiliary constraint (A.1). For each test instance and different values of  $\tilde{q}$  we preserve the same data set (10) and the same initial ambiguity set (28). The results are reported in Table A.8.

We observe that both relative gaps ( $\mathbf{G}_1$ ) and ( $\mathbf{G}_2$ ) tend to decrease whenever  $\tilde{q}$  approaches to its lower or upper bounds. This observation can be justified as follows. For  $\tilde{q} \in \{0, 1\}$  one of the linear expectation constraints (A.2) or (A.3) is redundant. Hence, if  $\tilde{q}$  close to its bounds, then verification of some constraints of the form (A.1) may not improve the user's objective function value. We infer that for  $\tilde{q} \approx 0$  and  $\tilde{q} \approx 1$  the values of ( $\mathbf{G}_1$ ) and ( $\mathbf{G}_2$ ) are relatively small.

In conclusion, we point out that the results of this section are rather consistent with the results of Section 4.3. That is, the quality of adaptive decisions and the computational complexity of the MIP formulation (19) increase in the number of the auxiliary distributional constraints.