

# Decentralized Routing on Spatial Networks with Stochastic Edge Weights

Till Hoffmann

*Department of Physics, University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom*

Renaud Lambiotte

*Naxys, University of Namur, Namur, Belgium and Department of Mathematics, University of Namur, Namur, Belgium*

Mason A. Porter

*Oxford Centre for Industrial and Applied Mathematics,  
Mathematical Institute, University of Oxford, Oxford,  
United Kingdom and CABDyN Complexity Centre, University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom*

We investigate algorithms to find short paths in spatial networks with stochastic edge weights. Our formulation of the problem of finding short paths differs from traditional formulations because we specifically do not make two of the usual simplifying assumptions: (1) we allow edge weights to be stochastic rather than deterministic; and (2) we do not assume that global knowledge of a network is available. We develop a decentralized routing algorithm that provides en route guidance for travelers on a spatial network with stochastic edge weights without the need to rely on global knowledge about the network. To guide a traveler, our algorithm uses an estimation function that evaluates cumulative arrival probability distributions based on distances between pairs of nodes. The estimation function carries a notion of proximity between nodes and thereby enables routing without global knowledge. In testing our decentralized algorithm, we define a criterion that allows one to discriminate among arrival probability distributions, and we test our algorithm and this criterion using both synthetic and real networks.

PACS numbers: 89.75.Hc, 89.40.-a, 84.40.Ua, 89.20.Hh

*Introduction.* One of the most important aspects of many networks is their navigability [1–3], and it is often important to find short paths between pairs of nodes in a network. For example, sending packages across the Internet, attempting to spread ideas through social networks, and transporting people or goods cheaply and quickly all require the ability to find paths with a minimal number of steps or a minimal cost [4]. Assuming that the network topology and the cost of making a step is known, such paths can be found easily [5]. Unfortunately, complete knowledge of network topology (and edge weights) is often not available or constitutes an insurmountable overhead [6–9].

Despite the aforementioned difficulties, empirical evidence demonstrates that some networks can be navigated by using only local information [30]. A well-known example is Milgram’s small world experiment [6], which showed that short paths between individuals in social networks exist and that individuals are able to navigate the network without global knowledge of network topology. This observation was put on solid theoretical ground more than 30 years later by Kleinberg [10], who showed that one can find short paths between nodes via decentralized algorithms in certain types of spatially-embedded networks [11]. This work has led to a series of theoretical and numerical studies on routing with limited information [4, 12] and on the importance of embedding a network into space when developing routing algorithms [13–16].

An important limitation of the above theoretical find-

ings is their assumption that the cost of making a step is deterministic. In many situations, it is much more appropriate to model the cost as a random variable. For instance, varying levels of congestion on networks [17–19] make it unsuitable to model such costs deterministically. The aim of this Letter is to address this important limitation and to develop a decentralized algorithm for routing in stochastic networks.

*Deterministic Shortest-Path Problem (DSPP).* A network  $G$  consists of a set of nodes  $N$  labeled by indices  $\{i_1, \dots, i_n\}$  (and with cardinality  $|N| = n$ ) and a set of edges  $E$  (with  $|E| = m$ ) labeled by ordered pairs of indices  $(i, j)$ , which indicates that there is a directed edge from node  $j$  to node  $i$ . We associate a weight  $T_{ij}$ , representing a cost or travel time, with each edge  $(i, j)$ . A path  $\ell$  with  $k$  steps is a sequence of  $k + 1$  nodes  $\ell = \{i_1, \dots, i_{k+1}\}$  that are connected to one another via edges. The weight  $T_\ell$  of a path  $\ell$  is given by the sum of the weights of its constituent edges:

$$T_\ell = \sum_{j=1}^k T_{i_j i_{j+1}}.$$

The shortest-path problem (SPP) aims to determine the path from an *origin* node to a *target* node that has the smallest total weight. In the DSPP, each edge weight  $T_{ij}$  is deterministic, and a path with minimal total weight is considered to be *optimal*.

*Stochastic Shortest-Path Problem (SSSP).* To define an SSSP, we let the weights  $T_{ij}$  be real-valued random vari-

ables that are distributed according to a probability distribution function (PDF) with probabilities  $p_{ij}$  [18–22]. For example, non-deterministic travel times are a typical feature of transportation networks [17]. Because this is our motivating example, we will use the terms “time” and “weight” interchangeably. In our SSSP formulation, we make three assumptions: (1) the random edge weights are independent of each other; (2) the PDFs do not change during the routing process; and (3) the weight incurred by traversing an edge becomes known upon completion of the step. (For example, the time taken to travel a road is known once the next junction is reached.) With these assumptions, it follows that the PDF for the weight  $T_\ell$  of a path  $\ell$  to have a value  $t$  is given by the convolution of the PDFs of the weights associated with the path [23]:

$$p_\ell(t) = \left( \underset{j=1}{\overset{k}{*}} p_{i_j i_{j+1}} \right) (t), \quad (1)$$

where the right-hand side denotes  $k$  consecutive convolutions. The probability to traverse the path  $\ell$  and incur a weight  $T_\ell \leq t$  is given by the cumulative distribution function (CDF)

$$u_\ell(t) = \int_0^t dt' p_\ell(t').$$

*Criteria.* Because the edge weights are now random variables, we need to reconsider the concept of an optimal path. In particular, there is no longer a unique concept of optimality. For example, Frank [20] defined a path to be optimal if its CDF surpasses a threshold  $\theta$  within the shortest time, whereas Fan et al. [18] suggested maximizing the CDF for a given time budget  $\tau$ . Each of these criteria has a regime in which it outperforms the other. If the budget  $\tau$  available to a traveler is large, then there are many paths leading to almost certain arrival at the desired target; that is,  $u_{\ell'}(\tau) \approx 1$  for many paths  $\ell'$ . In this regime, the paths are virtually indistinguishable using Fan et al.’s criterion. However, Frank’s criterion can easily identify the path that it deems to be optimal. In contrast, if the budget is small, then arrival at the target within the budget is unlikely; that is,  $u_{\ell''}(\tau) \ll 1$  for all paths  $\ell''$ . In this case, Frank’s criterion is not helpful because there does not exist a path whose CDF surpasses the threshold. However, Fan et al.’s criterion can identify the path with the maximal CDF for the given budget. With the above in mind, we define a joint criterion that takes advantage of both criteria. If there are paths whose CDFs surpass a threshold  $\theta$  within the budget  $\tau$ , then we choose a path according to Frank’s criterion. Otherwise, we choose a path according to Fan et al.’s criterion. Figure 1 illustrates the differences between the criteria.

*An Adaptive Algorithm.* Even finding approximate solutions to the SSPP is challenging. An interesting approach was proposed by Fan et al., who utilized an adaptive algorithm that evaluates the available information




FIG. 1: Comparison of path optimality criteria using CDFs of three paths. Fan et al.’s criterion prefers paths 2 and 3 to path 1 but cannot discriminate between the CDFs of paths 2 and 3. Frank’s criterion prefers path 2 to path 3 but cannot be applied to path 1. The joint criterion is applicable to all CDFs and chooses path 2 as the optimal one.

before each step and account for the consequences of previous decisions [18]. They proposed building a routing table by considering the maximal probability to reach the target  $r$  from all other nodes  $i \in N \setminus \{r\}$ . This amounts to solving the following set of nonlinear integral equations:

$$u_i(t) = \max_{j \in J_i} \left[ \int_0^t p_{ij}(t') u_j(t-t') dt' \right], \quad (2)$$

$$u_r(t) = 1, \quad (3)$$

where  $u_i(t)$  is the probability to arrive at node  $r$  starting from node  $i$  with a total time no longer than  $t$  and  $J_i$  is the set of neighbors of  $i$ . The node  $q_i(t)$  that should be chosen to attain the maximal arrival probability is

$$q_i(t) = \arg \max_{j \in J_i} \left[ \int_0^t p_{ij}(t') u_j(t-t') dt' \right]. \quad (4)$$

One cannot find analytical solutions to Eqs. (2)–(4) in general, but the CDF  $u_i(t)$  can be approximated using the recursive sequence

$$v_i^{s+1}(t) = \max_{j \in J_i} \left[ \int_0^t p_{ij}(t') v_j^s(t-t') dt' \right], \quad (5)$$

$$v_r^{s+1}(t) = 1,$$

with index  $s$  and initial conditions

$$v_i^0(t) = 0, \quad \forall i \in N \setminus \{r\}.$$

The sequences  $\{v_i^s(t)\}$  give lower bounds for the true CDFs. The sequences  $\{w_i^s(t)\}$  with the same recursion relation (5) but with different initial conditions

$$w_i^0(t) = 1, \quad \forall i \in N$$

gives an upper bound [24]. In our numerical implementation, we demand that the sequences converge to within a numerical tolerance  $\epsilon$  for all  $t$ . That is, we require that

$$w_i^s(t) - v_i^s(t) < \epsilon, \quad \forall i \in N$$

for sufficiently large  $s$ .

*Estimation function.* Fan et al.'s algorithm is centralized, as it requires a knowledge of a system's geometry to determine shortest paths. To build a decentralized algorithm, we define an *estimation function*  $f(i, j; t)$ , which gauges the arrival probability from node  $j$  to  $i$  within time  $t$ . Such a function carries a notion of proximity between nodes, and we will use it to guide travelers on a network.

To define an estimation function, we proceed as follows. First, we embed a network in a metric space and denote by  $d_{ij}$  the *distance*—i.e., the *length* of the edge—between nodes  $i$  and  $j$ . Second, we define the *network distance*  $g_{ij}$  as the shortest distance between nodes if travelers are restricted to move along edges. Note that the network distance is distinct from the travel time. We assume that the network distance can be estimated from the distance between edges. That is, we assume that there exists a function  $h$  such that  $g_{ij} \approx h(d_{ij})$ . Such an assumption is implicit in all decentralized algorithms using a metric for guidance. Third, we note that the expected number of steps necessary to reach node  $i$  from node  $j$  is

$$\bar{k} = \left\lceil \frac{g_{ij}}{\lambda} \right\rceil \approx \left\lceil \frac{h(d_{ij})}{\lambda} \right\rceil,$$

where  $\lambda$  denotes the mean edge length in the network. Fourth, in the absence of any further knowledge about the network, we assume that the weight  $\bar{t}$  incurred by making a step towards the target is chosen uniformly at random from the weights associated with the edges. The PDF of  $\bar{t}$  is the mixture distribution [25]

$$\bar{p}(t) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{(i,j) \in E} p_{ij}(t),$$

and we estimate the weight of the unknown path  $\bar{\ell}$  from  $j$  to  $i$  to be

$$t_{\bar{\ell}} = \sum_{k=1}^{\bar{k}} \bar{t}.$$

We make indirect use of global knowledge by using  $\lambda$  and  $\bar{p}(t)$  as a characteristic length scale and PDF. In practice, however, one can calculate such characteristics by sampling a network (e.g., using traffic-flow measurements), so direct global knowledge is not required. In other cases, such characteristics might even be known *a priori*. Using Eq. (1), the associated CDF is

$$f(i, j; t) = \begin{cases} \int_0^t dt' \left( \frac{\bar{k}}{k=1} \bar{p} \right) (t'), & \text{if } i \neq j, \\ 1, & \text{if } i = j. \end{cases}$$

We thereby use physical distance to evaluate the number of steps between two nodes, and we assume that the random weight associated with each edge is uncorrelated




FIG. 2: [Color online] (a) A lattice with the origin given by a square and the target given by a star. (b) The data available to a decentralized algorithm before the first step. We show a network traveler's current node as a square and frontier nodes as triangles. We enclose the known subgraph  $G_K$  by a dashed contour. Panel (c) shows the available data before the second step, and panel (d) shows the available data before the third step.

with the length of the edge. In the Supplementary Online Material (SOM), we show that the order of carrying out mixtures and convolutions is irrelevant.

*Decentralized algorithm.* Our algorithm explores a network by using local information, and it chooses a locally optimal node according to one of the criteria discussed above. The nodes that have been visited  $N_V$  and the frontier nodes  $N_F$  constitute a known subgraph  $G_K$  (i.e., the parts of the graph that the traveler has discovered). Frontier nodes are neighbors of visited nodes but have not yet been visited themselves. The known subgraph includes all edges of  $G$  that are connected to the known nodes  $N_K = N_V \cup N_F$ . Importantly, naively stepping towards the node that is a locally optimal choice without incorporating information about the journey to date can trap a traveler in a dead end. Developing an algorithm with knowledge of  $G_K$  enables a traveler to navigate out of dead ends.

In this local approach, we build on Fan et al.'s algorithm [18, 24] and apply it to  $G_K$  by changing the initial conditions of the sequences  $\{v_i^s(t)\}$  and  $\{w_i^s(t)\}$  for frontier nodes using the estimation function:

$$v_j^0(t) = w_j^0(t) = f(j, r; t), \quad \forall j \in N_F.$$

We initialize nodes that have been visited in the same manner as before. We then iterate the two sets of sequences until they converge to within a chosen tolerance  $\epsilon$ . The traveler then moves to a successor node that is identified by one of the criteria, and we then update  $G_K$ . We reduce the remaining budget by the weight incurred by making the step. We repeat this process until the traveler reaches the target or the budget is exhausted. Figure 2 illustrates this routing process on a lattice.

We require  $w_i^k(t)$  to provide upper bounds for the CDFs. In centralized routing, such an upper bound is equal to 1 because the target is part of the network under consideration. In our decentralized situation, the upper bound for the CDF of a node in  $G_K$  is

$$f_{\max}^r(t) = \max_{j \in N_F} [f(r, j; t)].$$

Changing the initial conditions of visited nodes to

$$w_i^0(t) = f_{\max}(t), \quad \forall i \in N_V$$

accelerates the convergence of the two sets of sequences because it reduces the initial differences between them. We provide pseudocode for our decentralized algorithm in the SOM.

*Simulations.* Noland et al. [17] (and references therein) investigated traffic flow data sets and found that they possess lognormal travel time distributions, so we use this class of distributions for our simulations. To determine edge weights, we assign lognormal PDFs  $p_{\ln}(\mu, \sigma; t)$  with mean  $\mu$  and standard deviation  $\sigma$  chosen uniformly at random in the interval  $[0.5, 1.5]$ . The relevant mixture distribution is thus

$$\bar{p}(t) = \int_{0.5}^{1.5} d\mu \int_{0.5}^{1.5} d\sigma p_{\ln}(\mu, \sigma; t).$$

We consider four different tests: we use Fan et al.’s centralized algorithm and our new decentralized algorithm in combination with both Fan’s criterion and the joint criterion that we described previously.

We test our algorithm on a variant of Kleinberg’s small-world network [26]. We start with a  $10 \times 10$  square lattice with an undirected edge between neighboring nodes in the grid, and we also assign an undirected shortcut edge from each node  $i$  to exactly one other node. We determine the shortcut’s destination node using independent random trials such that the probability of such a long-range edge is proportional to  $1/D_{ij}^2$ , where  $D_{ij}$  is the lattice distance between  $i$  and  $j$ . (In determining shortcuts, we discard duplicate edges.) We let  $d_{ij} = D_{ij}$  and approximate the network distance by  $g_{ij} \approx h(d_{ij}) \equiv d_{ij}$ . The mean edge length of an ensemble of  $10^3$  networks is  $\lambda \approx 1.421 \pm 0.002$ . Suppose that the origin of the routing process is at  $(2, 2)$  and that the target is at  $(9, 9)$ , where  $(x, y)$  designates a node using its lattice coordinates. We run each test  $10^3$  times for a range of budgets (see Fig. 3), a CDF threshold of  $\theta = 0.8$ , and a tolerance of  $\epsilon = 10^{-3}$ . (An error in arrival probability smaller than a tenth of a percent will not affect real travelers.)

As shown in Fig. 3(a), the arrival fraction—i.e., the fraction of routing attempts that reach the target within a given budget—increases with increasing budget. Centralized algorithms know the entire network topology and can thus make better decisions, so they have larger arrival fractions. As shown in Fig. 5 in the SOM, the arrival fraction of Fan et al.’s centralized algorithm using the joint criterion is almost independent of the threshold. Because the local neighbors of any node are located in the cardinal directions, the arrival CDFs are sufficiently different for CDF maximization and travel time minimization to agree. We obtain the same results using our decentralized algorithm. Travelers thus choose the same successor node irrespective of the threshold  $\theta$ ; this results in the same arrival fraction.




FIG. 3: [Color online] Fraction of routing attempts that successfully reach the target on the (variant of the) Kleinberg network as a function of budget for a CDF threshold of  $\theta = 0.8$  and a tolerance of  $\epsilon = 10^{-3}$ .

Because centralized algorithms are aware of all shortcuts in a network, they have smaller mean travel times than decentralized ones (see Fig. 4). For small budgets ( $\tau \lesssim 10$ ), the travel times of all algorithms increase with increasing budget. The algorithms choose neighbor nodes to visit to maximize the CDF, which results in longer travel times because it is advantageous to exhaust the budget. For budgets  $\tau$  satisfying  $10 \lesssim \tau \lesssim 17$ , the travel times using Fan et al.’s criterion and our joint criterion start to differ. The joint criterion starts to minimize travel times in this regime until they approach a steady value. Fan et al.’s criterion, however, continues to maximize CDFs such that travel times grow with increasing budget. For larger budgets ( $\tau \gtrsim 17$ ), Fan et al.’s criterion is unable to distinguish between the CDFs of neighboring nodes, and algorithms using this criterion enter an unguided phase (i.e., one can construe a traveler to be “lost”). The algorithm steps to neighbor nodes seemingly at random until the budget decreases sufficiently for Fan et al.’s criterion to discriminate among CDFs. As illustrated in Fig. 4, the travel time using Fan et al.’s criterion increases linearly with the budget in this regime.

In the SOM, we discuss simulations using a network for the Chicago area and illustrate the use of Euclidean distance (in the physical space of the network) versus network distance.

*Conclusions.* We have examined decentralized routing on networks with stochastic edge weights. Our contributions are twofold. First, we have introduced a new criterion to discriminate among the CDFs of paths. It circumvents the limitations of Fan’s and Frank’s criteria while retaining the desirable properties of both because it minimizes travel times without a *de facto* sacrifice of reliability. It also provides a better caricature of the behavior of real travelers [27]. Second, we have developed a decentralized routing algorithm applicable to networks with stochastic edge weights. Our algorithm employs a CDF estimation function that captures a notion of proximity




FIG. 4: [Color online] Mean travel time of successful routing attempts. We separate small, intermediate, and large budgets using dashed vertical lines. The error bars correspond to three standard deviations from the mean.

in space and guides network travelers without the need to incorporate global knowledge about a network. Our simulation results demonstrate that decentralized routing on networks with stochastic edge weights is viable. This type of approach appears to be very promising, and investigating the limitations of such an approach and also the situations in which it can best succeed are important topics for future research. Possible improvements of our algorithm include the development of more sophisticated choices of estimating functions that incorporate edge lengths, edge weights, and their correlations. We expect this work to be particularly interesting in studies of routing on temporal networks, in which the existence and other properties of edges are time-dependent.

*Acknowledgements.* We thank Aaron Clauset, Sang Hoon Lee, and Peter Mucha for useful discussions. MAP acknowledges a research award (#220020177) from the James S. McDonnell Foundation and a grant from the EPSRC (EP/J001759/1). He also thanks some mathematicians from University of Bath who came to Oxford (because of a convenient workshop) and returned his umbrella. This paper presents research results of the Belgian Network DYSCO, which were funded by the IAP Programme and initiated by Beslpo.

- [9] D. Krioukov, K. C. Claffy, K. Fall, and A. Brady, SIGCOMM Comput. Commun. Rev. **37**, 41 (2007)
- [10] J. M. Kleinberg *et al.*, Nature **406**, 845 (2000)
- [11] M. Barthélemy, Physics Reports **49**, 1 (2011)
- [12] M. Rosvall, P. Minnhagen, and K. Sneppen, Phys. Rev. E **71**, 066111 (2005)
- [13] D. Liben-Nowell, J. Novak, R. Kumar, P. Raghavan, and A. Tomkins, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America **102**, 11623 (2005)
- [14] D. J. Aldous and J. Shun (2010), arXiv:1003.3700
- [15] S. H. Lee and P. Holme, Physica A **390**, 3996 (2011)
- [16] S. H. Lee and P. Holme (2012), arXiv:1206.6651
- [17] R. B. Noland and J. W. Polak, Transport Reviews **22**, 39 (2002)
- [18] Y. Y. Fan, R. E. Kalaba, and J. E. Moore, Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications **127**, 497 (2005)
- [19] Y. M. Nie and X. Wu, Transportation Research Part B: Methodological **43**, 597 (2009)
- [20] H. Frank, Operations Research **17**, pp. 583 (1969)
- [21] R. P. Loui, Commun. ACM **26**, 670 (September 1983)
- [22] A. Eiger, P. B. Mirchandani, and H. Soroush, Transportation Science **19**, 75 (1985)
- [23] P. G. Hoel, S. C. Port, and C. J. Stone, *Introduction to Probability Theory*, Houghton Mifflin series in statistics (Houghton Mifflin, 1971)
- [24] Y. Fan and Y. Nie, Networks and Spatial Economics **6**, 333 (2006)
- [25] S. Frühwirth-Schnatter, *Finite Mixture and Markov Switching Models* (Springer Verlag, 2006)
- [26] J. Kleinberg, in *Proceedings of the Thirty-Second Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC '00 (ACM, New York, NY, USA, 2000) pp. 163–170
- [27] K. A. Small, The American Economic Review **72**, pp. 467 (1982)
- [28] H. Bar-Gera, “Transportation network test problems,” <http://www.bgu.ac.il/~bargera/tntp/>
- [29] B. Efron and R. Tibshirani, *An introduction to the bootstrap*, Monographs on statistics and applied probability (Chapman & Hall, 1993)
- [30] Our initial motivation for studying our formulation of this problem arose when one of the authors accidentally left his umbrella at University of Bath and had to find a way to get it back to Oxford without further travel on his part.

- 
- [1] A. Clauset and C. Moore (2003), arXiv:cond-mat/0309415
  - [2] M. Boguñá, D. Krioukov, and K. C. Claffy, Nature Physics **5**, 74 (2009)
  - [3] P. Erola, S. Gómez, and A. Arenas, Int. J. Complex Systems in Science **1**, 37 (2011)
  - [4] M. E. J. Newman, *Networks: An Introduction* (Oxford University Press, 2010)
  - [5] E. Dijkstra, Numerische Mathematik **1**, 269 (1959)
  - [6] S. Milgram, Psychology Today **2**, 60 (1967)
  - [7] P. Berman, Online Algorithms, 232(1998)
  - [8] D. Peleg and E. Upfal, Journal of the ACM **36**, 510 (1989)

### Pseudocode for Our Decentralized Algorithm

In Algorithm 1, we give pseudocode for our decentralized routing algorithm for networks with stochastic edge weights.

---

**Algorithm 1** Our decentralized routing algorithm, which builds on the iterative approximation scheme developed by Fan and Nie [24]. The input parameters are a network  $G$ , an origin node, a target node, a time budget  $\tau$ , a CDF threshold  $\theta$ , and a CRITERION to identify successor nodes.

---

```

function DECENTRALISEDROUTING( $G$ , origin, target,  $\tau$ ,  $\theta$ , CRITERION)
  (current, traveltime)  $\leftarrow$  (origin, 0)
  steps  $\leftarrow$  {(current, traveltime)}
   $N_V \leftarrow$  {current}
5:  while traveltime  $\leq$   $\tau$  and current  $\neq$  target do
       $N_F \leftarrow i \quad \forall \{(i, j) \in E : j \in N_V \text{ and } i \notin N_V\}$  ▷ Obtain frontier nodes.
       $v_i^0(t) \leftarrow w_i^0(t) \leftarrow f(i, \text{target}; t) \quad \forall i \in N_F$  ▷ Initialize frontier nodes.
       $f_{\max}^{\text{target}}(t) = \max_{i \in N_F} [f(i, \text{target}; t)]$  ▷ Obtain upper bound.
       $v_j^0(t) \leftarrow 0 \quad \forall j \in N_V$  ▷ Initialize visited nodes.
10:   $w_j^0(t) \leftarrow f_{\max}^{\text{target}}(t) \quad \forall j \in N_V$ 
      unstable  $\leftarrow N_V$ 
       $s \leftarrow 0$ 
      while current  $\in$  unstable do
           $v_i^{s+1}(t) = \max_{j \in J_i} \left[ \int_0^t p_{ij}(t') v_j^s(t-t') dt' \right] \quad \forall i \in \text{unstable}$  ▷ Update the sequences.
15:   $w_i^{s+1}(t) = \max_{j \in J_i} \left[ \int_0^t p_{ij}(t') w_j^s(t-t') dt' \right] \quad \forall i \in \text{unstable}$ 
           $s \leftarrow s + 1$ 
          for  $i \in \text{unstable}$  do
              if  $|v_i^s(t) - w_i^s(t)| < \epsilon \quad \forall t$  then ▷ Check for convergence.
                  remove  $i$  from unstable
20:  end if
          end for
          end while
           $q_{\text{current}}(t) = \arg \max_{j \in J_{\text{current}}} \left[ \int_0^t p_{\text{current } j}(t') v_j^s(t-t') dt' \right]$ 
          successor  $\leftarrow$  CRITERION( $v_{\text{current}}^s(t)$ ,  $q_{\text{current}}(t)$ ,  $\tau - \text{traveltime}$ ,  $\theta$ ) ▷ Obtain the successor node.
25:  traveltime  $\leftarrow$  traveltime + random sample of  $T_{\text{successor}, \text{current}}$  ▷ Update the travel time.
      add successor to  $N_V$  ▷ Extend the known subgraph.
      current  $\leftarrow$  successor ▷ Make the step to the successor.
      add (current, traveltime) to steps
  end while
30:  return steps
end function

```

---

### Arrival Fractions Obtained by Fan et al.'s Centralized Algorithm

In Fig. 5, we demonstrate that the arrival fraction of Fan et al.'s centralized algorithm [18] using our joint criterion is almost independent of the CDF threshold  $\theta$ .

### Simulations on the Chicago Network

We also tested our algorithm using a road network for the United States city of Chicago [28]. We show this network in Fig. 6.

In the main text, we claimed that there exists a function  $h$  such that the network distance between two nodes  $i$  and  $j$  is well approximated by  $h(d_{ij})$ . Our computations with the Chicago network will allow us to examine this claim more closely. Figure 7 demonstrates that the Euclidean distance

$$d_{ij} = \sqrt{(x_i - x_j)^2 + (y_i - y_j)^2}$$




FIG. 5: Arrival fractions obtained by Fan et al.'s centralized algorithm as a function of CDF threshold for tolerance  $\epsilon = 10^{-3}$  and several different budgets. The error bars in the two panels correspond to three standard deviations from the mean.




FIG. 6: The Chicago road network, which has 542 nodes representing junctions and 1084 edges representing roads. We show a path in red.

is correlated strongly with the network distance. Based on a linear bootstrap fit [29], the best choice for  $h \approx g_{ij}$  is

$$h(d_{ij}) \approx 0.547(8) \text{ km} + 1.1176(4) \times d_{ij},$$

where  $d_{ij}$  has units of km. [Recall that “0.547(8)” means that the error bars place the value between 0.539 and 0.555.]

The slope of the linear fit is larger than 1 because the Euclidean distance between any pair of nodes provides a lower bound for the network distance between the nodes.

We obtain similar results when using the lattice distance

$$d_{ij} = |x_i - x_j| + |y_i - y_j| \quad (6)$$

between nodes  $i$  and  $j$ . In this case, the slope of the linear fit is smaller than 1 because the lattice distance provides an approximate upper bound for the network distance. Complicated paths, such as zigzag paths, can of course violate this approximate bound.

The mean edge length of the network is  $\lambda \approx 1.89$  km. We choose the origin and target nodes uniformly at random such that their Euclidean distance lies in the interval [13.1, 16.4] km. We consider the same four tests as in the main text and run each test  $10^3$  times for a range of budgets, a CDF probability threshold  $\theta = 0.8$ , and a numerical tolerance  $\epsilon = 10^{-3}$ .

We illustrate the arrival fractions as a function of budget, which reveals the same qualitative behavior as on the (variant of the) Kleinberg small-world network, in Fig. 8(a). As with the Kleinberg network, the arrival fraction of algorithms using the joint criterion exhibits little dependence on the CDF threshold  $\theta$  [see Fig. 8(b)]. In Fig. 9, we show that the travel times of centralized algorithms are smaller than those of decentralized algorithms because the former know all shortcuts in the network.




FIG. 7: Probability density of Euclidean distances between nodes versus network distances between nodes. The Pearson correlation coefficient is  $\rho \approx 0.985$ , which justifies the linear fit shown in red.






FIG. 8: (a) Fraction of routing attempts that successfully reach the target on the Chicago network as a function of budget for a CDF threshold of  $\theta = 0.8$  and a tolerance of  $\epsilon = 10^{-3}$ . (b) Arrival fractions obtained by Fan et al.'s centralized algorithm as a function of CDF threshold for tolerance  $\epsilon = 10^{-3}$  and several different budgets. The error bars in the two panels correspond to three standard deviations from the mean.




FIG. 9: Mean travel time of successful routing attempts. We separate small, intermediate, and large budgets using dashed vertical lines. The error bars correspond to three standard deviations from the mean.

### Mixture of Convolutions Versus Convolution of Mixtures

Let  $F = \{f_i(x)\}$ ,  $G = \{g_j(y)\}$  be two finite sets of probability density functions (PDFs) and let the mixtures of the elements of the sets be given by

$$\bar{f}(x) = \sum_i \omega_{f_i} f_i(x),$$

$$\bar{g}(y) = \sum_j \omega_{g_j} g_j(y),$$

where  $\omega_{f_i}$  and  $\omega_{g_j}$ , respectively, are the independent weights associated with the elements of  $F$  and  $G$ . Taking the mixture after performing the convolution of the elements of  $F$  and  $G$  gives

$$\sum_{ij} \omega_{f_i} \omega_{g_j} (f_i * g_j) (z) = \int_0^z dx \sum_{ij} \omega_{f_i} f_i (z - x) \omega_{g_j} g_j (x) = \int_0^z dx \bar{f} (z - x) \bar{g} (x) = (\bar{f} * \bar{g}) (z) .$$

Therefore, provided that the assumption of independent weights holds, it follows that mixing the result of a convolution is equivalent to taking the convolution of two mixtures.

Consider  $b$  sets of probability distributions  $\{F_1, \dots, F_b\}$ . Let each set  $F_i$  have  $c_i$  elements. Carrying out the convolutions of all pairs of probability distributions in the sets first and taking the mixture afterwards requires  $\left(\prod_{i=1}^b c_i\right)$  convolutions and additions. However, carrying out the mixtures first and then performing the convolutions requires  $b$  convolutions and  $\left(\sum_{i=1}^b c_i\right)$  additions. It is thus much more efficient computationally to compute the mixtures first and subsequently perform the convolutions.

---