

Path Planning Problem under non-probabilistic Uncertainty

Keivan Shariatmadar¹

¹ Department of Computer Science, M-Group, Campus Bruges, KU Leuven, Belgium

keivan.shariatmadar@kuleuven.be

Abstract

This paper considers theoretical solutions for path planning problems under non-probabilistic uncertainty used in the travel salesman problems under uncertainty. The uncertainty is on the paths between the cities as nodes in a travelling salesman problem. There is at least one path between two nodes/stations where the travelling time between the nodes is not precisely known. This could be due to environmental effects like crowdedness (rush period) in the path, the state of the charge of batteries, weather conditions, or considering the safety of the route while travelling. In this work, we consider two different advanced uncertainty models (i) probabilistic—precise uncertain model: Probability distributions and (ii) non-probabilistic—imprecise uncertain model: Intervals. We investigate what theoretical results can be obtained for two different optimality criteria: maximinity and maximality in the travelling salesman problem.

Keywords— automated guided vehicles, travelling salesman problem, maximinity & maximality, imprecise decision theory, path planning

1 Introduction

Automated guided vehicles or AGVs are mobile robots or autonomous vehicles. They perform transportation tasks in many (industrial) applications to transport goods/materials around large (industrial) buildings, such as a factory or warehouses. For instance, they transport materials/goods from warehouses to material handling in assembly lines, to a pharmacy, to a supermarket, or a bookstore see e.g., [22]. Not only one robot but a fleet of mobile robots cooperate to perform an efficient transport of materials, goods, or products. One of the main applications in path planning is the travel salesman problem which is widely used in automated guided vehicle problems. In resource management, the current industrial automated guided vehicle systems operate under known paths or routes to control the whole deterministic fleet of automated guided vehicles. In realistic manufacturing systems, there are usually uncertainties regarding the availability of accessible paths or routes to travel between nodes, and even worse, in the presence of uncertainty, the uncertainty is not always unique and varies (advanced uncertainty). In this work, we consider the travelling salesman problem under an advanced (non)probabilistic uncertainty model. The uncertainty is between the nodes e.g., task locations or charging stations in a factory with at least one automated guided vehicle. Since 1954, [18] AGVs are widely used in logistical environments all over the globe and are now on the rise in a lot of other areas and applications. Current AGV systems—mobile robots—incorporate high-technological features to manage the (whole) fleet of robots in more efficient, safer, and *deterministic* ways. Although, there are some features which are unchanged for years see e.g., [21, 4, 6, 12, 26]. An interesting problem in (deterministic) resource management systems in current industrial systems are the decentralised AGV system. The AGVs perform a specified sequence of transportation tasks between different locations in a known deterministic operating area/paths. The current optimised path planning is based on deterministic paths and routes between nodes or charging stations [27]. In current manufacturing processes, this has an impact if a path or a route is crowded or not available for a while. For example, the path is crowded or affected by weather conditions. Especially in rush hours, some routes are loaded with other agents like humans/operators, vehicles or other AGVs. In other words, the availability of the paths between the nodes/stations is not deterministic and it is uncertain. In this paper, we will represent the Travelling Salesman Problem[25, 24, 23] (TSP)—where there is uncertainty at least in one path between two nodes/stations. The travelling salesman approach is widely used in the AGV problem. We assume there is uncertainty in the travelling time (distance) between the cities. The uncertainty is given in two formats: (i) probabilistic, such as distribution functions, and (ii) non-probabilistic, such as interval (advanced case). We will use an uncertain TSP to illustrate our approaches in both cases. We convert the uncertain TSP to a decision problem via imprecise decision theory which is one of our past works[28]. In the advanced uncertainty case, we will give the solutions¹ under two decision optimality criteria—maximinity and maximality.

Generally, the potential applications of this paper can be extended to larger scopes, such as delivery cars, trucks, or autonomous/semi-autonomous (electrical) vehicles where, for instance, those trucks or cars are tasked to travel/move in a path of pickup and drop off points where the path (availability) is uncertain. Our approach can be implemented in these

Abbreviations: AGV, automated guided vehicles; LP, linear programming; LPUU, LP under uncertainty; TSP, travelling salesman problem; CDF, cumulative distribution function; PDF, probability density function

¹In probabilistic case (i), both maximin and maximal solutions coincide.

situations in a way that drivers/fleet managers can be advised to choose a better path on their uncertain trajectory to get time-energy optimal paths. In other words, the approach presented here can be implemented in every resource-based transportation system because of its simplicity and generality.

The paper is organised as follows. In Section 2, a short recap and definitions of *coherent lower and upper previsions*, as well as the *imprecise decision theory* and the current literature on resource management in AGV systems, are given, for more info about imprecise probability theory, see Section. A. In Section 3, the theoretical results are discussed, together with solutions of Uncertain TSP^{II}. Section 4 discusses comparisons with reviews of the existing literature to compare our method and results. Section 5 discusses the conclusions and future work.

2 Overview and definitions of the theoretical framework

This section helps the reader to grasp a quick view of the most important concepts of imprecise probability^{III} and uncertain linear programming (LP) problems. To make the concept of coherent lower previsions in imprecise probabilities theory more understandable, a short description will be given in Section. 2.2. In Section. 2.3 the concept of imprecise decision theory is explained. In the next Section 2.1 we will talk about LP problems and generic LP under uncertainty (LPUU) problems.

2.1 Linear programming problems

In previous works [28, 17, 20, 19] analytical methodologies and some numerical solutions for the LP under advanced ϵ -contamination, interval, fuzzy sets, and probability-box uncertainty models have been discussed. There are many applications for LP under uncertainty (LPUU) problems, some are discussed by *Dantzig* in Example 2. [1], which is usually about finding the *minimum expected cost* for example, the lowest cost of diet in a *Nutrition problem*. Here are some interesting broader applications of optimisation under uncertainty: Optimisation under uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence, Operation of reservoirs, Generation of electrical power, Portfolio selection and optimisation, Inventory management, Facility planning, Stabilisation of mechanisms, Pollution control and Analysis of biological systems [11]. In the next two subsections 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 we will discuss a mathematical overview of the LP and LPUU problems, respectively.

2.1.1 Mathematical overview of LP problems

A standard or canonical LP problem is expressed as follows [5]:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximise} && c^T x \\ & \text{such that} && Ax \leq b, x \geq 0 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is an optimisation variable, $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ is the coefficient matrix, $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the objective function coefficient vector and $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is the constraint vector.

2.1.2 Mathematical overview of LPUU problems

An LPUU problem is a generalisation of the LP problem where at least one of the parameters (coefficients) of the LP problem is uncertain. There is at least one element of the coefficients' matrices (c^T , A , or b) of the LP problem (1), which is uncertain or generally *unknown* i.e., they are not deterministic, we do not know the exact values or the values are not known, precisely. For instance, the only information about the coefficient is just boundaries i.e., lower and upper values in an interval, or some probabilistic information. The challenge lies in optimising an objective linear function in an unknown domain (set). Usually, we do not know exactly whether the problem is feasible or not because the coefficients of the constraints or the goal function are uncertain. In other words, the problem—maximising a linear function over the unknown set (unknown *feasibility space*)—is not well-posed. The generic (standard) uncertain linear programming problem is defined in the following form.

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximise} && U^T x \\ & \text{such that} && Yx \leq Z, x \geq 0 \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a vector of optimisation variables x_j , U is a random vector taking variables $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the matrices Y and Z are random variables taking values $y \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and $z \in \mathbb{R}^m$, respectively^{IV}.

^{II}The difficulty of the theoretical solutions is reduced to well-posed classical problems by illustrating imprecise decision theory in this paper.

^{III}For more details, we propose consulting the reference book [7] as well as Section A.

^{IV}We assumed that y_{ij} , z_i and u_j the elements of Y , Z and U are independent. In this paper, we work with the maximisation operator. Since $\min U^T x = -\max -U^T x$ therefore all results and proves can be applied and held for the minimisation operator as well.

2.2 Imprecise Uncertainty modelling—Coherent lower and upper previsions

Suppose^V an unknown variable $(Y, Z) =: V$, that takes values $(y, z) =: v$ in a set $\mathbb{R}^{m \times n} \times \mathbb{R}^m =: \mathcal{Y}$ and a decision maker (agent) who wants to make decisions about a problem that is a function of V . The uncertainty of the agent working with this V is given using an uncertainty model which allows him to do reasoning about V or a function of V and make the decisions in the problem involving V . Classical uncertainty models are unique probability distributions. In this case, we call the uncertain variable V a *random variable*. It has been shown [8] that working with expectation tools is the same as working with probability measures or probability distributions. In this paper, the same terminology of Walley [7] is used where the expectation operator is called linear prevision/expectation. A linear prevision is a functional P such that $P : \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{Y}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ where $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{Y})$ is a linear space on \mathcal{Y} . The linear prevision P satisfies the following three coherence conditions:

(Positivity) $P(g) \geq \inf g$; (Homogeneity) $P(\lambda g) = \lambda P(g)$; (Additivity) $P(g + h) = P(g) + P(h)$ for all bounded real-valued functions g, h in $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{Y})$ and all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. The functional $g = g(V)$ is interpreted as a gamble about V and its linear prevision (P_V) as a fair price to exchange this gamble, see e.g., [29]. An agent (decision maker) is willing to sell the gamble $g(V)$ for any price higher than $P_V(g)$ and buy it for any lower price. For an event, $A \in \mathcal{Y}$ the linear prevision is also denoted by P . In this case, P is called probability measure on the set of all events $2^{\mathcal{Y}}$, i.e., $P : 2^{\mathcal{Y}} \rightarrow [0, 1]$. The relationship between them is given by $P(A) := P(I_A)$ where $I_A \in 2^{\mathcal{Y}}$ is the indicator function of A —it takes the value 1 on A and is 0 otherwise. The three coherence conditions for a probability measure P are: (Positivity) $P(A) \geq 0$; (Unit Norm) $P(\mathcal{Y}) = 1$; (Additivity) $P(A \cup B) = P(A) + P(B)$ where $A, B \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$, $A \cap B = \emptyset$. For more information on the linear prevision, we refer the reader to A.1.2.

2.3 Imprecise decision making

Consider a case that the agent may choose a decision x between several choices, acts, or decisions in a set $\mathcal{X} := \mathbb{R}^n$, the outcome of each decision is uncertain and is a function of the random variable V taking values v . For each possible decision x there is a gain (loss) function G_x on \mathcal{Y} , that is, if a decision is made x , then the result of this decision has utility $G_x(v)$ where v is the outcome of the random variable V .

In this paper, we assume that for each decision x there is a corresponding bounded function (gamble) G_x where $G_x : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. If the uncertainty about V is described by a coherent lower prevision \underline{P} , then a binary relation in the set \mathcal{X} of all decisions can be defined as follows: decision x_1 is better than decision x_2 and we write $x_1 \succ x_2$ if and only if the agent is willing to pay some strictly positive prices to exchange G_{x_1} for G_{x_2} , that is,

$$x_1 \succ x_2 \Leftrightarrow \underline{P}(G_{x_1} - G_{x_2}) > 0, \quad (3)$$

according to the definition, the relation \succ gives us a very useful interpretation, a strict partial order on \mathcal{X} . For instance, when the uncertainty about V is represented by a linear prevision P then from the 2.2 property and equation (21) we have

$$x_1 \succ x_2 \Leftrightarrow \forall P \in \mathcal{M}(\underline{P}), P(G_{x_1}) > P(G_{x_2}), \quad (4)$$

which means, the action x_1 is better than x_2 if and only if x_1 has a strictly higher expected utility than x_2 for all P that dominate the lower prevision \underline{P} (which is a similar robustness property). In the next section, two decision criteria are described—maximinity and maximality.

2.3.1 Maximality

Consider a case that a decision maker seeks decisions x —so-called maximal decisions/solutions—that are undominated in pairwise comparison with all other decisions (partial order), i.e., no decision z is considered better than x :

$$\begin{aligned} x \text{ is maximal} &\Leftrightarrow \nexists z \in \mathcal{X}, z \succ x \equiv \forall z \in \mathcal{X}, z \not\succ x \\ &\Leftrightarrow \forall z \in \mathcal{X}, \underline{P}(G_z - G_x) \leq 0 \\ &\Leftrightarrow \forall z \in \mathcal{X}, \overline{P}(G_x - G_z) \geq 0 \equiv \inf_{z \in \mathcal{X}} \overline{P}(G_x - G_z) \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

2.3.2 Γ -maximin (Maximinity)

Maximin solutions derive from worst-case reasoning, i.e., they are the decisions that have the highest lower expected utility (worst-case scenario),

$$x \text{ is maximin or gamma maximin} \Leftrightarrow x \in \operatorname{argmax}_{z \in \mathcal{X}} \underline{P}(G_z) \quad (6)$$

Similarly, maximaxity solutions—best-case reasoning/scenario—can be found by simply replacing the lower prevision \underline{P} with the upper prevision \overline{P} in (6).

Proposition 1. *Any maximin solutions are also in the maximal solutions set.*

^VFor the general uncertainty models and a tool—expectation operators or probability measures for (Y, Z) in problem (2)—we direct the reader to [7]. The uncertainty models—probability measures, intervals, and so on—can all be special cases of uncertainty modelling framework: the theory of coherent lower previsions (and imprecise probability theory in general) see, e.g. [7, 14].

Proof. Due to the properties of the upper prevision in Subsection A.1.2, we have:

$$\overline{P}(G_x - G_z) \geq \underline{P}(G_x) + \overline{P}(-G_z) = \underline{P}(G_x) - \underline{P}(G_z)$$

□

In both the maximinity and maximality criteria, $\operatorname{argmax}_{z \in \mathcal{X}} \underline{P}(G_z)$ and $\inf_{z \in \mathcal{X}} \overline{P}(G_x - G_z)$ are functions of x in \mathcal{X} , therefore, we need to calculate and find that (i) in maximinity: for which $z \in \mathcal{X}$ the function $\underline{P}(G_z)$ has the highest value, and (ii) in maximality: the function $\inf_{z \in \mathcal{X}} \overline{P}(G_x - G_z)$ is positive or zero^{VI}.

2.4 Reformulation of LPUU problem as an imprecise decision problem

In Section 1 we talked about the LP problem (1) which is about maximising a linear function over a (convex) set. By adding uncertainty to the constraints (or the goal function), we have a slightly more difficult problem (2) that is not a well-posed problem: maximising a linear objective function over an uncertain set. To obtain a well-posed problem, we reformulate the problem (2) to a decision problem under uncertainty, as follows:

First, we define a utility (gain/loss) function (gamble) G_x for each decision $x \geq 0$, as such:

$$G_x := (c^T x - L)I_{Yx \leq Z} + L \quad (7)$$

$I_{Yx \leq Z}(v)$ is an indicator function that is equal to one if x is in the feasibility space and is zero when x is infeasible for any realisations $v = (y, z)$ that the random variable $V = (Y, Z)$ assumes. It is obvious that for each decision $x \geq 0$ and any outcome or realisation (y, z) when x is feasible (or equivalently $I_{Yx \leq Z}(v) = 1$) then we have a reward equal to $c^T x$ otherwise we have to be punished with real value L (or equivalently $I_{Yx \leq Z}(v) = 0$). In other words,

$$G_x(y, z) = \begin{cases} c^T x & yx \leq z, \\ L & yx \not\leq z. \end{cases}$$

$L \in \mathbb{R}$ is small enough and is interpreted as a penalty/punishment value for violating the constraints. A real number, strictly smaller than $\inf c^T x$ (in maximisation) should be chosen to ensure that breaking the constraint is penalised. If there are several penalty values $L_i \in \mathbb{R}$ for each i -th constraint, then we can define $L := \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} |L_i|$. With this reformulation, it is clear that both the maximums for the objective function $c^T x$ and the gain function G_x are equivalent. Second, in order to consider the uncertainty about V and quantify it, we use an optimality criterion. In this paper, we consider two optimality criteria: maximinity/worst-case reasoning and maximality/partial ordering which we discussed in Section. 2.3.

2.4.1 Set of maximin and maximal solutions for the LPUU problem

By applying the maximinity criterion in (6) to the gain/loss function defined in (7) and two Constant additivity and Positive Homogeneity properties of the lower prevision, we find the set of maximin solutions which is given by,

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{argmax}_{x \geq 0} \underline{P}(G_x) &= \operatorname{argmax}_{x \geq 0} \underline{P}((c^T x - L)I_{Yx \leq Z} + L) \\ &= \operatorname{argmax}_{x \geq 0} (c^T x - L)\underline{P}(Yx \leq Z). \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Applying the maximality criterion in (5) to the gain function defined in (7), we have that $x \geq 0$ is maximal if and only if

$$\inf_{w \geq 0} \overline{P}((c^T x - L)I_{Yx \leq Z} - (c^T w - L)I_{Yw \leq Z}) \geq 0. \quad (9)$$

In the next section, we apply these theoretical solutions to a generic TSP and present two sets of optimal solutions.

3 Optimal solutions for uncertain TSP

Generally, a TSP is a specific form of the generic LP problem. To model our approach, we will build further on the well-known TSP model given by [15] representation. The TSP is a mathematical graph theory problem used in computer science to model real-world specific optimisation problems such as path planning problems.

3.1 Mathematical model of uncertain TSP

Assume that n selected cities on a salesman's^{VII} tour are the vertices set (similar to the set V in a graph). The graph's set of edges E corresponds to the different connections/paths between each city. Since the salesman can travel from any city to another, the graph is complete. In other words, there is an edge between every pair of nodes. For each edge (i, j) on the graph, we associate a binary variable I_{ij} ,

$$I_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & (i, j) \in E \\ 0 & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

^{VI}For further information and details in decision making with imprecise probabilities, we refer to [13].

^{VII}The salesman can be interpreted as an AGV or an agent in different domains, as well.

Since in the TSP, the edges are undirected then $x_{ij} = x_{ji}$ and it suffices to only include edges with $i < j$ in the problem (mathematical model), as follows. A salesman has the task of visiting n cities x_1, \dots, x_n starting from an origin city x_1 . The salesman does not know (is uncertain about) all the distances between each city. He has some probabilistic or interval uncertainty models about the distances. He has to visit every city once and has an uncertain distance matrix $U_D = [u_{ij}^d]$. U_D is random matrix taken values u_{ij}^d —the uncertain distance from city i to city j . He has to visit all cities once in such a way that the total travelled time is minimised. After he visited all the cities, he has to return to the starting city x_1 . The cost function $g_u(x)$ and the constraint in the TSP can be formulated like an LPUU problem as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_x g_u(x) &:= \min_x \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} (u_{x_i, x_{i+1}}^t \cdot I_{ij}) + u_{x_n, x_1}^t \\ \text{such that } &\sum_{j \in V} I_{ij} = 2, \\ &I_{ij} \in \{0, 1\}, \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where, $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ represents a whole tour which contains every city x_i once, and $u_{x_i, x_{i+1}}^t$ is the uncertain travelled time^{VIII} between city x_i and city x_{i+1} . For simplicity, a constant speed v_c is assumed, and consequently, the uncertain travel time $u_{x_i, x_{i+1}}^t$ is defined as follows:

$$u_{x_i, x_{i+1}}^t := \frac{u_{x_i, x_{i+1}}^d}{v_c} \quad (11)$$

Based on the problem definition in (10), g_u is the uncertain total time travelled to visit every city once when following the tour x . The goal of the problem is to find a tour x that minimises this objective function g_u . This optimised tour x contains cities and stations that are optimally chosen for the salesman/AGV to visit. The AGV starts with an already optimised tour^{IX} which is received from a central or decentralised task allocation algorithm. This task allocation algorithm outputs a TSP-optimised tour containing all the locations where AGV has to visit (to pick up or drop off a load). Our aim here is to give a classical TSP where the uncertainty of the uncertain TSP (10), is eliminated. From Section 2.4, we reformulate the problem 10 to a decision problem as follows,

$$G_x(u) := \begin{cases} g_u(x) & \sum_{j \in V} I_{ij} = 2 \\ L & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \equiv \quad (g_u(x) - L) I_{\{\sum_{j \in V} I_{ij} = 2\}} + L \quad (12)$$

where $L < \min_{(x,u)} g_u(x)$ is chosen as the real number (punishment) and $I_{\{\cdot\}}$ is an indicator function on the set $\{\cdot\}$. In the next Sections 3.2 and 3.3, we give the maximin and maximal solutions for the uncertain TSP in two uncertainty models—Probability distribution and interval cases.

3.2 Probabilistic case—Probability distributions

Assume that the uncertainty about the random matrix $U_D = [u_{ij}^d]$ —the durations between two nodes/cities x_i and x_j —is given by a probability measure P . As explained in Section A.1.1 and Equation (19), the optimal solutions for the TSP (10) are

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{argmin}_x P(G_x(u)) &= \operatorname{argmin}_x P((g_u(x) - L) I_{\{\sum_{j \in V} I_{ij} = 2\}}) \\ &= \operatorname{argmin}_x P\left(\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} (u_{x_i, x_{i+1}}^t \cdot I_{ij}) + u_{x_n, x_1}^t - L\right] I_{\{\sum_{j \in V} I_{ij} = 2\}}\right) \\ &= \operatorname{argmin}_x \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} (P(u_{x_i, x_{i+1}}^t) \cdot I_{ij}) + P(u_{x_n, x_1}^t) - L \right] P(I_{\{\sum_{j \in V} I_{ij} = 2\}}) \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where the solution (13) is a classical (crisp) TSP and it depends on the punishment value L .

3.3 Non-probabilistic case—Intervals

In this case, for simplicity, we will work with the hypograph model of the linear optimisation problem (10) since the uncertainty is in the goal function. The hypograph model is defined as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad &\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} (u_{x_i, x_{i+1}}^t \cdot I_{ij}) + u_{x_n, x_1}^t \quad \equiv \quad \min \quad s \\ \text{such that } &\sum_{j \in V} I_{ij} = 2, \quad I_{ij} \in \{0, 1\} \quad \text{such that } \sum_{j \in V} I_{ij} = 2, \quad I_{ij} \in \{0, 1\} \\ &\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} (u_{x_i, x_{i+1}}^t \cdot I_{ij}) + u_{x_n, x_1}^t \leq s, \quad s \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

^{VIII} u_{x_n, x_1}^t is the uncertain travelled time between the last city x_n and the starting city x_1 .

^{IX}optimal tour by optimal inserting extra cities (optimal insertion of charging stations and the time it will charge at these stations.) into optimal tour if the robot is not able to finish the tour without charge.

As it is explained in Section A.2, the uncertainty about $U_D = [u_{ij}^d]$ is modelled by coherent lower prevision \underline{P}_U on $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ for a given $h = h(U)$ on A as,

$$\underline{P}_U(h) := \min_{u \in A} h(u) \quad \text{equivalently,} \quad \overline{P}_U(h) := \max_{u \in A} h(u) \quad (15)$$

where $A := \times_{k=1}^n A_k$; $A_k := [\underline{y}_k, \overline{y}_k]$.

3.3.1 Maximin Solutions

From equation (25), the optimal solutions for the hypograph model (14) are

$$\operatorname{argmax}_x \underline{P}(G_x(u)) = \operatorname{argmax}_{x \in \underline{A}} \underline{P}(s) \quad (16)$$

where \underline{A} is inner feasibility space,

$$\underline{A} := \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} (\underline{u}_{x_i, x_{i+1}}^t \cdot I_{ij}) + \underline{u}_{x_n, x_1}^t \leq s, s \geq 0 \wedge \sum_{j \in V} I_{ij} = 2, \quad I_{ij} \in \{0, 1\} \right\}.$$

where the maximin solution is a classical (crisp TSP) LP problem and it is not dependent on the punishment value L .

3.3.2 Maximal Solutions

From equation (29), the optimal solutions for the hypograph model (14) are all x 's, in the outer feasibility space \overline{A} ,

$$\overline{A} := \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} (\overline{u}_{x_i, x_{i+1}}^t \cdot I_{ij}) + \overline{u}_{x_n, x_1}^t \leq s \wedge \sum_{j \in V} I_{ij} = 2, \quad I_{ij} \in \{0, 1\} \wedge s \geq \max(x_m, 0) \right\},$$

where x_m is the maximin solution. Again here the maximal solutions are not dependent on L and the set \overline{A} is convex (feasibility space).

4 Comparison with related literature—alternative existing solutions and examples

Let's now contrast the presented methods with some closely related approaches from the literature on two types of uncertainty models in the TSP and LP problem.

Changjoo and Dylan [21] have studied a sensitivity analysis in a multi-robot task allocation problem where the coefficient of the cost function varies between bounded intervals (non-probabilistic case). They gave two algorithms which are exhaustive searches to analyse the sensitivity and not quantify the uncertainty—e.g., in an indeterministic problem, how to make the decision when either availability or traffic on a path is uncertain? There are some other works where only the sensitivity of the problem—and not uncertainty quantification in indeterministic problems—is considered [4].

Ward and Richard [6] gave approaches to sensitivity analysis in linear programming. Here our method considers reasoning about uncertainty in the coefficient matrix in constraints or the goal function under two different uncertainty models.

Lin and Wen [12] wrote about the sensitivity analysis of objective function coefficients of an assignment problem. The focus is only on the special case of an LP problem and only on the sensitivity of the goal function.

Soyster [3] investigates so-called *inexact linear programming problems*:

$$\begin{aligned} & \max \quad c^T x \\ & \text{such that} \quad Yx \leq b, \quad x \geq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

where $c, x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$, and the uncertain matrix Y is interval relative to a convex subset $K := \times_{j=1}^n K_j$ of matrices, where each K_j is a convex subset of \mathbb{R}^m . This paper uses the maximin decision criterion, so this is a special case of Section. A.2.1 where, in Equation (23) we have now concluded that $\underline{K} = \{x \geq 0 : \overline{y}x \leq b\}$, where \overline{y} is the matrix with components $\overline{y}_{ij} := \max_{y \in K} y_{ij}$. In Section. 2.1.2 we gave a very general case that the uncertainty can be represented in all coefficients. However, in many optimisation problems involving interval-based uncertainty—formalised by vacuous previsions in this paper—the work above fits in the large body of literature. Most of the work uses maximin as the optimality criterion; The results and methods we derive in this paper for the maximality case in Section. A.2.2 are novel and make the state of the art richer.

Jamison and Lodwick [10] worked on *Fuzzy linear programming problems*^X. Their approach is based on the approach by Bellman and Zadeh [2]. We translate and explain the approach for this discussion relevant to our context.

^XWorking with TSP under Fuzzy sets is our current research, however here we emphasise the selection of penalty value L compare to our simple approach.

As we present in Section. 2.4, their idea is to first move the original problem into an unconstrained optimisation problem: maximise $c^T x - L_{y_x \underline{z} z} I_{y_x \underline{z} z}$, using, however, a variable penalty factor $L := L_{y_x \underline{z} z}$, where L is a function of x on \mathbb{R}^n that gives the larger a penalty the more severely the constraint is broken. Then a fuzzy number—a possibility distribution on \mathbb{R} — $\tilde{G}_x := c^T x - L_{\tilde{y}_x \underline{z} \tilde{z}} I_{\tilde{y}_x \underline{z} \tilde{z}}(x)$ is associated with every x in \mathbb{R}^n using the extension principle; these can be seen as fuzzy gains. They define the solutions of the problem to be those x with a maximal midpoint average: $\frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 (\max G_x(t) - \min G_x(t)) dt$, where $G_x(t) := \{\alpha \in \mathbb{R} : \tilde{G}_x(\alpha) \geq t\}$ is the level set at t . This optimality criterion lies qua idea in between maximinity and maximaxity, but not qua execution, as how we use possibility distributions to express uncertainty differs markedly.

5 Conclusions

In this paper, we looked at a general uncertain TSP with uncertain available paths/routes between cities/stations and investigated how uncertainty can be dealt with parameters in the constraints as well as in the goal function. We have presented theoretical solutions for the generic uncertain TSP with probability distributions and interval uncertainty models. We have discussed the way to reformulate the generic uncertain TSP into a well-posed decision problem according to the probabilistic and interval cases. We have then modelled the uncertainty by using coherent lower (and upper) previsions and proposed theoretical solutions for the decision problem in two typical optimality criteria—maximinity and maximality.

By solving the decision problems we have obtained (i) in maximinity: classical linear optimisation problems (without uncertainty), and (ii) in maximality: classical (convex) feasibility problems. Using maximinity results is a less complicated mathematical problem concerning the maximality criterion. In summary,

Model	<i>Maximin theoretical solutions</i>	<i>Maximal theoretical solutions</i>
<i>Probability distributions</i>	classical LP problem	classical LP problem
<i>Interval</i>	classical LP problem	convex feasibility problem

To calculate or implement these theoretical solutions under any numerical applications, any classical linear optimisation problem solver or feasibility problem solver could be used as follows

Model	<i>Maximin calculation</i>	<i>Maximal calculation</i>
<i>Probability distributions</i>	any LP solver	any LP solver
<i>Interval</i>	any LP solver	any convex feasibility space solver

The paper proposes a way to solve uncertain AGV systems in maximality and maximinity criteria for both uncertainty models. Our next intent is to work towards efficient algorithms (computer codes) to implement numerical solutions to our theoretical results and compare the complexity with the existing algorithms as well as to extend our approaches to the multi-AGV systems and more advanced uncertainty models such as Fuzzy sets, or Probability Box.

Acknowledgments

This work is supported by the M-Group, at campus Bruges–KU Leuven. The author thanks all support from Matthias De Ryck.

Financial disclosure

MATLAB Licence (Number: 919019 for Version: 9.5.0.1067069 (R2018b) Update 4)

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that they have no potential conflict of interest.

Supporting information

None reported.

References

- [1] George B. Dantzig. “Linear Programming under Uncertainty”. English. In: *Management Science* 1.3/4 (1955), pp. 197–206. ISSN: 00251909. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2627159>.
- [2] R. E. Bellman and L. A. Zadeh. “Decision-making in a fuzzy environment”. In: *Management Science* 17.4 (1970), B-141–B-164. DOI: 10.1287/mnsc.17.4.B141.

- [3] A. L. Soyster. “Convex Programming with Set-Inclusive Constraints and Applications to Inexact Linear Programming”. In: *Operations Research* 21.5 (Sept. 1973), pp. 1154–1157. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/16893>
- [4] T. Gál. *Postoptimal analyses, parametric programming, and related topics*. Advanced Book Program - McGraw-Hill Book Company. McGraw-Hill International, 1979. ISBN: 9780070226791. URL: <https://books.google.be/>
- [5] G.L. Nemhauser, A.H.G. Rinnooy Kan, and M.J. Todd. *Handbooks in Operations Research and Management Science, 1: Optimization*. 2nd. Amsterdam: North-Holland/Elsevier, 1989. ISBN: 978-0-444-87284-5.
- [6] James E. Ward and Richard E. Wendell. “Approaches to sensitivity analysis in linear programming”. In: *Annals of Operations Research* 27.1 (Dec. 1990), pp. 3–38. ISSN: 1572-9338. DOI: 10.1007/BF02055188. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02055188>.
- [7] P. Walley. *Statistical Reasoning with Imprecise Probabilities*. Chapman & Hall/CRC Monographs on Statistics & Applied Probability. Taylor & Francis, 1991. ISBN: 9780412286605. URL: <https://books.google.be/books?id=N>
- [8] Peter Whittle. *Probability via Expectation*. 3rd. Springer, 1992.
- [9] Peter Walley and Gert de Cooman. “Coherence of rules for defining conditional possibility”. In: *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning* 21 (1999), pp. 63–107. DOI: 10.1016/S0888-613X(99)00007-9.
- [10] K. David Jamison and Weldon A. Lodwick. “Fuzzy linear programming using a penalty method”. In: *Fuzzy Sets and Systems* 119.1 (2001), pp. 97–110. DOI: 10.1016/S0165-0114(99)00082-2.
- [11] R. T. Rockafellar. “OPTIMIZATION UNDER UNCERTAINTY”. eng. In: *LECTURE NOTES* (2001), p. 118.
- [12] Chi-Jen Lin and Ue-Pyng Wen. “Sensitivity analysis of objective function coefficients of the assignment problem”. In: *Asia-Pacific Journal of Operational Research* 24.02 (2007), pp. 203–221. DOI: 10.1142/S021759590700111
- [13] M. C. M. Troffaes. “Decision making under uncertainty using imprecise probabilities”. In: *Int. J. Approx. Reason.* 45 (2007), pp. 17–29. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijar.2006.06.001.
- [14] Enrique Miranda. “A survey of the theory of coherent lower previsions”. In: *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning* 48 (2008), pp. 628–658.
- [15] Rajesh Matai, Surya Singh, and Murari Lal Mittal. “Traveling Salesman Problem: an Overview of Applications, Formulations, and Solution Approaches”. In: *Traveling Salesman Problem*. Ed. by Donald Davendra. Rijeka: IntechOpen, 2010. Chap. 1. DOI: 10.5772/12909. URL: <https://doi.org/10.5772/12909>.
- [16] Gert de Cooman, Enrique Miranda, and Marco Zaffalon. “Independent natural extension”. In: *Artificial Intelligence* 175.12-13 (2011), pp. 1911–1950. ISSN: 0004-3702. DOI: 10.1016/j.artint.2011.06.001. URL: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0004370211000737>.
- [17] Keivan Shariatmadar, Erik Quaeghebeur, and Gert De Cooman. “Linear programming under vacuous and possibilistic uncertainty”. eng. In: *ISIPTA '11: Program & Abstracts*. Innsbruck, Austria, 2011, p. 31.
- [18] Janusz Szpytko. “Automated Guided Vehicles Navigating Problem In Container Terminal”. In: *Logistics and Transport* 2.13 (2011), pp. 107–116.
- [19] Erik Quaeghebeur, Keivan Shariatmadar, and Gert De Cooman. “Constrained optimization problems under uncertainty with coherent lower previsions”. eng. In: *FUZZY SETS AND SYSTEMS* 206 (2012), pp. 74–88. ISSN: 0165-0114. DOI: 10.1016/j.fss.2012.02.004.
- [20] Erik Quaeghebeur et al. “Maximin and maximal solutions for linear programming problems with possibilistic uncertainty”. eng. In: *IPMU 4-299* (2012), pp. 430–439. ISSN: 1865-0929. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-642-31718-7_45.
- [21] C. Nam and D. A. Shell. “When to do your own thing: Analysis of cost uncertainties in multi-robot task allocation at run-time”. In: *2015 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. May 2015, pp. 1249–1254. DOI: 10.1109/ICRA.2015.7139351.
- [22] Roger Bostelman and Elena Messina. *Towards Development of an Automated Guided Vehicle Intelligence Level Performance Standard*. West Conshohocken, PA: ASTM International, Apr. 2016. ISBN: 978-0-8031-7633-1. DOI: 10.1520/STP159420150054.
- [23] Diego Pecin et al. “Improved branch-cut-and-price for capacitated vehicle routing”. In: *Mathematical Programming Computation* 9.1 (Mar. 2017), pp. 61–100. ISSN: 1867-2957. DOI: 10.1007/s12532-016-0108-8. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12532-016-0108-8>.
- [24] Diego Pecin et al. “New Enhancements for the Exact Solution of the Vehicle Routing Problem with Time Windows”. In: *INFORMS Journal on Computing* 29.3 (2017), pp. 489–502. DOI: 10.1287/ijoc.2016.0744. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1287/ijoc.2016.0744>.
- [25] Yu Zhang et al. “Routing optimization with time windows under uncertainty”. In: *Mathematical Programming* 175.1 (May 2019), pp. 263–305. ISSN: 1436-4646. DOI: 10.1007/s10107-018-1243-y. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10107-018-1243-y>.

- [26] M. De Ryck, M. Versteyhe, and K. Shariatmadar. “Methodology for a Gradual Migration from a Centralized towards a Decentralized Control in AGV Systems”. In: *2020 6th International Conference on Mechatronics and Robotics Engineering, Barcelona, Spain*. IEEE Xplore® digital library, 2020.
- [27] Matthias De Ryck, Mark Versteyhe, and Keivan Shariatmadar. “Resource Management in Decentralized Industrial Automated Guided Vehicle Systems”. In: *Journal of Manufacturing Systems* 54 (2020), pp. 204–214. ISSN: 0278-6125.
- [28] Keivan Shariatmadar et al. “CMMSE: Linear programming under ϵ -contamination uncertainty”. In: *Computational and Mathematical Methods* 2.2 (2020). e1077 cmm4.1077, e1077. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/cmm4.1077> eprint: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/cmm4.1077>. URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/cmm4.1077>.
- [29] Bruno de Finetti. *Theory of Probability*. 2 Volumes. Wiley, 1974–1975.

A Annex

In the next two sections, we will give maximin and maximal solutions to the problem (2) in two separate uncertainty models—linear previsions (or probability distributions) and vacuous previsions (or intervals).

A.1 Linear prevision model

Suppose that the uncertainty about the random variables Y and Z is given by cumulative distribution functions F_Y and F_Z respectively, which are (assumed to) be independent and F_V is a joint distribution of the random variable $V = (Y, Z)$, then we can find maximin and maximal solutions as follows.

A.1.1 Optimal solutions in linear prevision case

In this model, because of the property 2.2, the maximin and maximal solutions coincide and can be found by simply replacing the lower probability \underline{P} in Equation (8) with a probability measure P ,

$$\operatorname{argmax}_{x \geq 0} (c^T x - L) P(Yx \leq Z) \quad (18)$$

if Y is invertible then we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{argmax}_{x \geq 0} (c^T x - L) P(Yx \leq Z) &= \operatorname{argmax}_{x \geq 0} (c^T x - L) (1 - P(Yx \not\leq Z)) \\ &= \operatorname{argmax}_{x \geq 0} (c^T x - L) (1 - F_{Y^{-1}Z}(x)) \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where F is the cumulative distribution function.

A.1.2 Linear prevision properties

The conjugate operators \underline{P} and \overline{P} , defined for all gambles g on \mathcal{Y} and related by $\overline{P}(g) = -\underline{P}(-g)$, are characterised by the following three conditions:^{XI}

(Positivity) $\underline{P}(h) \geq \inf h$ or $\overline{P}(h) \leq \sup h$; (Positive Homogeneity) $\underline{P}(\lambda g) = \lambda \underline{P}(g)$ or $\overline{P}(\lambda g) = \lambda \overline{P}(g)$;
(Super/Sub-additivity) $\underline{P}(g + h) \geq \underline{P}(g) + \underline{P}(h)$ or $\overline{P}(g + h) \leq \overline{P}(g) + \overline{P}(h)$ where $g, h \in \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{Y})$ and $\lambda > 0$.

Their restriction to (indicators of) events is called coherent lower and upper probabilities. In the behavioural interpretation of [7], who follows the lead of [29] in this regard, lower and upper previsions for gambles are again seen as prices: respectively the agent's supremum acceptable buying price and infimum acceptable selling price. When the lower prevision coincides with the upper prevision, they are linear previsions see, e.g., [7]. All the uncertainty models we deal with fall into either category, but thanks to this framework, we can treat constrained (linear) optimisation problems with uncertain variables described by both types in the constraint specification in a unified way and with a unified interpretation. It also leaves the door open to similarly deal with problems involving other types of uncertainty models under the coherent lower prevision umbrella. Lower (and upper) previsions can also be defined for indicators of events that are exactly equivalent to the lower (and upper) probability of the same events, that is, $\underline{P}(I_A) = \underline{P}(A)$. In one special case, when the lower prevision coincides with the upper prevision, then the third condition (Super/Sub-additivity) becomes (Additivity) condition and we have linear previsions see, e.g. [7]. In addition, it has shown [9] that working with a coherent lower prevision \underline{P} is equivalent to working with a convex closed set of linear previsions (or probabilities) $\mathcal{M}(\underline{P})$, which is set of dominating linear previsions by \underline{P} :

$$\mathcal{M}(\underline{P}) := \{P : \forall h \in \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{Y}), P(h) \geq \underline{P}(h)\}. \quad (20)$$

And vice versa, \underline{P} is the lower envelope of the set $\mathcal{M}(\underline{P})$:

$$\underline{P}(h) := \min \{P(h) : P \in \mathcal{M}(\underline{P})\}, \quad \forall h \in \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{Y}). \quad (21)$$

There are some other properties for coherent lower (and upper) previsions which are used further on in this paper: (Constant additivity) $\underline{P}(h + \mu) = \underline{P}(h) + \mu$; (Mixed super-additivity) $\overline{P}(g + h) \geq \underline{P}(g) + \overline{P}(h)$; (Factorisation) $\underline{P}(f_1 f_2) = \underline{P}(f_1) \underline{P}(f_2)$ where $g, h \in \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{Y})$, $f_1 > 0$, f_1 and f_2 are independent see, e.g. [16] and $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$.

A.2 Vacuous model

In this case, the uncertainty about $V = (Y, Z)$ is modelled by a coherent lower prevision \underline{P}_V on $\mathcal{A} := A \times B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} \times \mathbb{R}^m$ for a given $g = g(V)$ on \mathcal{A} as,

$$\underline{P}_V(g) := \min_{v \in \mathcal{A}} g(v) \quad \text{equivalently,} \quad \overline{P}_V(g) := \max_{v \in \mathcal{A}} g(v) \quad (22)$$

where $A := \times_{k=1}^m \times_{l=1}^n A_{kl}$; $A_{kl} := [\underline{y}_{kl}, \overline{y}_{kl}]$, $B := \times_{k=1}^m B_k$; $B_k := [\underline{z}_k, \overline{z}_k]$.

^{XI}The assumption that \underline{P} and \overline{P} are defined on the whole of $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{Y})$ is not a trivial one in general: so-called natural extension from a partial specification requires solving a linear programming problem [7]Chapter 3. However, for the cases examined in this paper, natural extension just requires calculating a (Choquet) integral in the most complex case, which is far less computationally demanding.

A.2.1 Maximin solutions in vacuous case

By combining these vacuous prevision definitions in (22) with the Equation (8), the maximin solutions become a classical linear programming problem:

$$\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{argmax}_{x \geq 0} \underline{P}(G_x) &= \operatorname{argmax}_{x \geq 0} \left[(c^T x - L) \min_{(y,z) \in \mathcal{A}} I_{yx \leq z}(x) \right] \\
&= \operatorname{argmax}_{\{x \geq 0 : \forall (y,z) \in \mathcal{A}, yx \leq z\}} c^T x \\
&=: \operatorname{argmax}_{x \in \underline{\mathbb{A}}} c^T x
\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

where $\underline{\mathbb{A}} := \bigcap_{(y,z) \in \mathcal{A}} \{x \geq 0 : yx \leq z\}$ is an *inner feasibility space* and is calculated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\underline{\mathbb{A}} &:= \bigcap_{(y,z) \in \mathcal{A}} \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n : \sum_{l=1}^n y_{kl} x_l \leq z_k, k = 1, 2, \dots, m \right\} \\
&= \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n : (\forall (y,z) \in \mathcal{A}) \sum_{l=1}^n y_{kl} x_l \leq z_k, k = 1, 2, \dots, m \right\} \\
&= \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n : \max_{y_{kl} \in A_{kl}} \sum_{l=1}^n y_{kl} x_l \leq \min_{z_k \in B_k} z_k, k = 1, 2, \dots, m \right\} \\
&= \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n : \sum_{l=1}^n \bar{y}_{kl} x_l \leq \underline{z}_k, k = 1, 2, \dots, m \right\} =: \{x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n : \bar{Y}x \leq \underline{Z}\}
\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

Thus, the solution, in this case, can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\max_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} c^T x \\
&\text{such that } \bar{Y}x \leq \underline{Z}, x \geq 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

Indeed, if $\underline{\mathbb{A}} = \emptyset$, then the problem is infeasible.

A.2.2 Maximal solutions in vacuous case

We arrange the decision $x \geq 0$ in a (partial) order so that is not dominated by any other decisions $w \geq 0$. To do that, we divide the (decisions) space $(x, w) \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ into quadrants:

$x^+ \cap w^+$	$x^+ \cap w^-$
$x^- \cap w^+$	$x^- \cap w^-$

$$\begin{aligned}
x^+ &:= \{(y, z) \in \mathcal{A} : yx \leq z, x \geq 0\} & x^- &:= \{(y, z) \in \mathcal{A} : yx \not\leq z, x \geq 0\} \\
w^+ &:= \{(y, z) \in \mathcal{A} : yw \leq z, w \geq 0\} & w^- &:= \{(y, z) \in \mathcal{A} : yw \not\leq z, w \geq 0\}
\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

By considering the maximality definition (9) and all possible non-empty ($2^4 - 1 = 15$) cases where \mathcal{A} is relative to these quadrants, we seek an expression for $\bar{P}(G_x - G_w)$,

$$\bar{P}(G_x - G_w) = \begin{cases} c^T x - L & \mathcal{A} \cap x^+ \cap w^- \neq \emptyset, \\ 0 & \mathcal{A} \cap x^+ = \emptyset \wedge \mathcal{A} \cap w^- \neq \emptyset, \\ \max\{0, c^T x - c^T w\} & \mathcal{A} \cap x^+ \cap w^- = \emptyset \wedge \mathcal{A} \cap x^+ \neq \emptyset \wedge \mathcal{A} \cap w^- \neq \emptyset, \\ c^T x - c^T w & \mathcal{A} \cap x^+ \neq \emptyset \wedge \mathcal{A} \cap w^- = \emptyset, \\ L - c^T w & \mathcal{A} \cap x^+ = \emptyset \wedge \mathcal{A} \cap w^- = \emptyset. \end{cases}$$

The first three cases are always non-negative, the fourth one can be positive or negative, and the last one is always negative. Therefore, we consider the last two cases avoiding that $x \geq 0$ is not maximal, for more details see [17, 19]:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\inf_{w \in \mathbb{R}^n} \bar{P}(G_x - G_w) \geq 0 \\
&\Leftrightarrow \underline{\mathbb{A}} = \emptyset \vee (x \in \bar{\mathbb{A}} \wedge c^T x \geq \max_{w \in \underline{\mathbb{A}}} c^T w = c^T x_m)
\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

where, x_m is the maximin solution and $\bar{\mathbb{A}} := \bigcup_{(y,z) \in \mathcal{A}} \{x \geq 0 : yx \leq z\}$ is *outer feasibility space* and is calculated as

follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{\mathbb{A}} &:= \bigcup_{(y,z) \in \mathcal{A}} \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n : \sum_{l=1}^n y_{kl} x_l \leq z_k, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, m \right\} \\
&= \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n : (\exists (y, z) \in \mathcal{A}) : \sum_{l=1}^n y_{kl} x_l \leq z_k, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, m \right\} \\
&= \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n : \min_{y_{kl} \in A_{kl}} \sum_{l=1}^n y_{kl} x_l \leq \max_{z_k \in B_k} z_k, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, m \right\} \\
&= \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n : \sum_{l=1}^n \underline{y}_{kl} x_l \leq \bar{z}_k, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, m \right\} =: \{x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n : \underline{Y}x \leq \bar{Z}\}. \tag{28}
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, if $\underline{\mathbb{A}} \neq \emptyset$, then the maximal solutions become a classical feasibility problem:

$$\left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n : x \in \bar{\mathbb{A}} \text{ and } c^T x \geq c^T x_m \right\} \equiv \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n : \underline{Y}x \leq \bar{Z} \text{ and } c^T x \geq c^T x_m \right\}. \tag{29}$$

One of the interesting properties of these results is that the solutions in both criteria—maximinity and maximality—do not depend on L . The uncertainty model, in the incarnations described above, is a special case of the much more general coherent upper and lower previsions e.g., see for details and terminology [7, 14].