

Recoverable Robust Optimization with Commitment

Felix Hommelsheim* Nicole Megow* Komal Muluk† Britta Peis†

June 16, 2023

Abstract

We propose a model for recoverable robust optimization with *commitment*. Given a combinatorial optimization problem and uncertainty about elements that may fail, we ask for a robust solution that, after the failing elements are revealed, can be augmented in a limited way. However, we commit to preserve the remaining elements of the initial solution. We consider different polynomial-time solvable combinatorial optimization problems and settle the computational complexity of their robust counterparts with commitment. We show for the weighted matroid basis problem that an optimal solution to the nominal problem is also optimal for its robust counterpart. Indeed, matroids are provably the only structures with this strong property. Robust counterparts of other problems are NP-hard such as the matching and the stable set problem, even in bipartite graphs. However, we establish polynomial-time algorithms for the robust counterparts of the unweighted stable set problem in bipartite graphs and the weighted stable set problem in interval graphs, also known as the interval scheduling problem.

1 Introduction

Robust optimization is one of the major frameworks for dealing with uncertainty in the input data when solving optimization problems. The classical model is considered as rather conservative due to its lack of flexibility in adapting solutions for different realizations of the uncertainty. Thus several concepts have been proposed to allow for some recourse, e.g. recoverable robustness, adjustable robustness, demand and two-stage robustness. In these models, the amount of adaptation for a revealed scenario is limited in some way (via a given budget on cost or structural changes) and an initial solution can be potentially modified freely within these limits. However, an extreme change in the initial solution might be prohibitive in certain applications. Therefore, we introduce a new model in which we *commit* to the initial solution by ensuring that the final solution contains the partial remaining initial solution after the scenario is revealed. We introduce the model *Recoverable Robust Optimization with Commitment* as follows.

Consider a combinatorial optimization problem Π with ground set E , a set of feasible solutions $\mathcal{F} \subseteq 2^E$, and a weight function $w : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, where the task is to find a solution $S \in \mathcal{F}$ maximizing $w(S) = \sum_{e \in S} w(e)$. Throughout the paper we consider downward-closed sets \mathcal{F} , meaning that if $X' \subseteq X$ and $X \in \mathcal{F}$, then also $X' \in \mathcal{F}$. Additionally, for a set X and an element g , we use $X + g := X \cup \{g\}$ and $X - g := X \setminus \{g\}$. In the first stage in the setting of Recoverable Robust Optimization with Commitment, we choose a solution $S \in \mathcal{F}$ to the underlying problem Π . Then, in the second stage, at most one element $f \in E$ can be deleted, and at most one element $e \in E \setminus (S + f)$ can be added to $S - f$ such that the resulting set is still a solution, i.e., $S' = S - f + e \in \mathcal{F}$. We

*University of Bremen, Germany. {fhommels, nicole.megow}@uni-bremen.de

†RWTH Aachen University, Germany. {muluk@algo, peis@oms}.rwth-aachen.de

call S the *first-stage* solution and S' the *second-stage* solution. The goal is to choose a first-stage solution S that maximizes the weight of the second-stage solution, $w(S')$, in the worst-case. We usually call the deletion of the element the *interdiction* and the addition of the element the *recourse*. The interdiction can be seen as an *adversary*, who aims to delete an element $f \in E$ that decreases the objective value the most, and has full knowledge about which element $e \in E \setminus (S + f) \cup \emptyset$ we would add in the recourse when f is deleted. Thus, we solve the following problem:

$$\max_{S \in \mathcal{F}} \min_{f \in E \cup \emptyset} \max_{\substack{S-f+e \in \mathcal{F} \\ e \in E \setminus (S+f) \cup \emptyset}} w(S - f + e). \quad (\text{RP})$$

For a combinatorial optimization problem Π , we call the robust variant of Π as in (RP) the *robust counterpart* of Π , or ROBUST Π in short. For example, for the problem MATROID BASIS (MB), i.e., the problem to compute a basis of maximum weight in a matroid, we simply write ROBUST MATROID BASIS (RMB) to denote its robust counterpart as mentioned in (RP). We usually call the problem Π the *underlying* or *nominal* problem. Note that the definition of any robust counterpart directly follows from the definition of the corresponding nominal problem and the definition of (RP).

As an example, assume we own a car-rental company with a single car that we wish to lend to different customers at maximum total revenue. Each customer has its own interval in which they want to rent the car and a price they are willing to pay. If no uncertainty is involved, this is an interval scheduling problem. However, after the selection of the initial solution, some customer might withdraw from a contract, leading to less revenue for our company. We could still add unserved customers to our initial solution. However, these additional customers should not be in conflict with our initial solution, as these reservations are firm. As a concrete example, consider the five intervals $(1, 3)$, $(2, 5)$, $(4, 7)$, $(6, 9)$, $(8, 10)$ with weights 10, 8, 2, 8, and 10, respectively, each representing a customer. Picking $(1, 3)$, $(4, 7)$, and $(8, 10)$ is an optimal solution to the underlying problem with value 22. An optimal solution to the robust counterpart, however, is to pick only $(1, 3)$ and $(8, 10)$, knowing that if $(1, 3)$ or $(8, 10)$ is interdicted, in the recourse one can add $(2, 5)$ or $(6, 9)$, respectively. This leads to a worst-case weight of 18 after the interdiction and recourse. When considered the optimal solution to the underlying problem, the interval $(4, 7)$ blocks the recourse and the deletion of interval $(1, 3)$ would lead to a value of 12 in the robust version. This shows that selecting an optimal solution to the nominal problem need not be optimal for its robust counterpart.

In a natural generalization of our problem, we parameterize the interdiction set and the recourse action: a set $F \subseteq E$ of cardinality at most $k \geq 1$ can be deleted and at most $\ell \geq 1$ elements can be added in the recourse. We ask for a first-stage solution S that maximizes the worst-case outcome of the second-stage solution S' ; more formally, we solve the problem

$$\max_{S \in \mathcal{F}} \min_{F \subseteq E, |F| \leq k} \max_{\substack{(S \cup R) \setminus F \in \mathcal{F} \\ R \subseteq E \setminus (S \cup F), |R| \leq \ell}} w((S \cup R) \setminus F). \quad (k, \ell\text{-RP})$$

For a given nominal problem Π , we call the robust version of the problem (the one shown in $(k, \ell\text{-RP})$), the (k, ℓ) -robust counterpart of Π , in short (k, ℓ) -Robust Π . However, in this paper we mainly focus on the case $k = \ell = 1$ and assume this unless stated otherwise.

A closely related problem, which is interesting on its own and crucial for parts of our results, is the *bounded-regret* version of our problem. After the interdiction of an element $f \in E$, there is the recourse action that may add an element $e \in E \setminus (S + f)$ to the set $S - f$ which maximizes the total weight of the final solution. However, the weight of the final solution $w(S - f + e)$ could be less than the weight of the initial solution $w(S)$. This weight loss, $w(S) - w(S - f + e)$, can be seen as a *regret*; we denote it by $\Delta(f, S)$. The goal in the bounded-regret problem is to find a solution S of

	unweighted	weighted
(k, k) -ROBUST MATROID BASIS	Polynomial (Thm. 3.2)	Polynomial (Thm. 3.2)
$(1, 1)$ -ROBUST BIPARTITE MATCHING	NP-hard (Thm. 4.1)	NP-hard (Thm. 4.1)
$(1, 1)$ -ROBUST BIPARTITE STABLE SET	Polynomial (Thm. 5.1)	NP-hard (Thm. 5.5)
$(1, 1)$ -ROBUST INTERVAL STABLE SET	Polynomial (Thm. 6.1)	Polynomial (Thm. 6.1)

Table 1: Table of complexity results for various problems.

maximum weight such that the interdiction of any element $f \in E$ followed by a construction of the final solution $S - f + e$ results in a regret no greater than some given value $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$; more formally:

$$\max_{\substack{S \in \mathcal{F} \\ \Delta(f, S) \leq \lambda: \forall f \in E \cup \emptyset}} w(S), \quad \text{where } \Delta(f, S) = \min_{\substack{S-f+e \in \mathcal{F} \\ e \in E \setminus (S+f) \cup \emptyset}} w(S) - w(S - f + e) \quad (\lambda\text{-RP})$$

We denote the value of the optimal solution for $(\lambda\text{-RP})$ by $w_{opt}(\lambda)$. The bounded-regret version for general k and ℓ of the problem is defined analogously. However, in this work we only consider the above mentioned version for $k = \ell = 1$. Notice the tight connection between the bounded-regret version $(\lambda\text{-RP})$ and the robust counterpart (RP) of a problem. If we have a polynomial-time algorithm for $(\lambda\text{-RP})$, and if there are only polynomial-many different candidates for λ values, then one can enumerate over all λ values and solve $(\lambda\text{-RP})$ for each one of them. Finally, we are interested in the λ value which maximizes $w_{opt}(\lambda) - \lambda$. If we then choose $S \subseteq E$ that corresponds to the solution $w_{opt}(\lambda)$ as the first-stage solution of (RP), then the maximum regret after adversarial interdiction and our recourse will be at most λ . Thus, the corresponding value $\max_{\lambda} w_{opt}(\lambda) - \lambda$ gives us the optimal solution of (RP). Now, observe that for $k = \ell = 1$ the number of possible λ values is at most $O(|E|^2)$ and hence polynomially bounded. Note that λ can also be negative and hence we also enumerate over these choices.

1.1 Our Contribution

We give algorithms and complexity results for a variety of combinatorial optimization problems in the model of Recoverable Robust Optimization with Commitment. In this paper, we focus on underlying problems that are polynomial-time solvable. Unsurprisingly, some robust counterparts of polynomial-time solvable problems turn out to be NP-hard, even in the setting $k = \ell = 1$. However, in some cases the robust counterpart remains polynomial-time solvable. The most prominent problem in this category is the problem ROBUST MATROID BASIS. Here, we are able to show such a result even in a more general setting for any $k = \ell \geq 1$. In fact, we show that it suffices to solve the nominal problem for obtaining an optimal first-stage solution for the robust counterpart. For other problems, solving the robust counterpart is much more involved. Table 1 summarizes our results.

A major challenge in designing algorithms for the robust problem lies in the fact that a first-stage solution S must be robust against any interdiction with possible recourse taken into account. Intuitively, we may pre-compute for each element $f \in E$, a “backup element” for the scenario in which the element f fails. We then solve “the problem with backups”. However, this increases the problem complexity substantially as such backups must not be selected for the solution S and the uncertainty about the failing element (and its activated backup) causes complex dependencies.

Next, we discuss our main results for the different problems; definitions follow later.

Robust Matroid Basis problem (RMB). We show that an optimal solution to MATROID BASIS (MB) is also an optimal first-stage solution for its robust counterpart, even for the general setting $k = \ell \geq 1$. Hence, the classical Greedy for MB implies a polynomial-time algorithm for RMB.

Further, we show that for any non-matroid this property is not true. Hence, matroids are exactly those structures for which the *price of robustness*, i.e., the worst-case ratio between the weight of an optimal solution to the underlying problem and the weight of an optimal first-stage solution to its robust counterpart, is guaranteed to be one.

Robust Bipartite Matching problem (RBM). Even for the unweighted case, we show that RBM is NP-hard; we give a reduction from 3-SAT. Here, the underlying problem BIPARTITE MATCHING can be viewed as a special case of a matroid intersection problem. Hence, our complexity result for RBM reveals a drastic increase in the problem difficulty when the underlying problem is finding a maximum-weight basis of the *intersection of two matroids* instead of a *single matroid*. This is quite a surprise, as for a single matroid, even the optimal solution of the nominal problem is optimal for its robust counterpart.

Robust Bipartite Stable Set problem (RBSS). A maximum-weight stable set in a graph is the complement of a minimum-weight vertex-cover, which in bipartite graphs can be found (in polynomial-time) using maximal matchings. Hence, the complexity of BIPARTITE STABLE SET and BIPARTITE MATCHING is the same and even the algorithms are very similar. However, the complexity of the robust counterpart ROBUST BIPARTITE STABLE SET (RBSS) depends highly on the weights. We show that, for unit weights, RBSS is polynomial-time solvable (even in more general *König-Egerváry* graphs). We prove this by (essentially) reducing the problem to finding repairable maximum stable sets, which are maximum stable sets S satisfying that for each $v \in S$ there is some $u \in V \setminus S$ s.t. $S + u - v$ is a stable set. We then show that repairable maximum stable sets can be found in polynomial time (if they exist). Further, we show that RBSS is NP-hard in the weighted setting.

Robust Stable Set in Interval Graphs (RIS). We give a polynomial-time algorithm for ROBUST INTERVAL STABLE SET, the stable set problem in interval graphs. For convenience, we view this problem as selecting disjoint intervals from a set of intervals, and call it ROBUST INTERVAL SCHEDULING (RIS). Our key ingredient is a reduction of RIS to its bounded-regret version. In general it is not straightforward how to construct a polynomial-time algorithm for the bounded-regret problem, even in the case of the matroid basis problem for which we know that the robust counterpart can be solved efficiently. As a crucial step, we show that for a given λ , the bounded-regret ROBUST INTERVAL SCHEDULING problem can be reduced to a more general Interval Scheduling problem, which we call INTERVAL SCHEDULING WITH COLORS (ISC) and for which we give an efficient algorithm by dynamic programming.

1.2 Related Work

Within the field of robust optimization [5], our work is related to previously proposed models that allow some recourse in decision-making. Most general and prominent appears the framework of *recoverable robustness*, introduced by Liebchen et al. [28] in the context of timetabling, linear programs, and railway optimization. Given a nominal problem with some uncertainty set and a recovery bound, the task is to find a feasible solution to the nominal problem that can be transformed to a feasible solution in each of the scenarios respecting the recovery bound (e.g. size of the symmetric difference of the solutions). The cost of the solution is the sum of the cost of the first- and the second-stage solution, possibly with different cost functions. The complexity of many combinatorial optimization problems has been studied in this framework; see, e.g., [9, 15, 19, 22, 24, 26, 27]. Most related are models considering *structural uncertainty*, i.e., some unknown set of input elements can be interdicted [13, 23]. Our model can be seen as a refined model of recoverable robustness with

structural uncertainty in which we allow limited recourse (via a parameter) and explicitly commit to a first-stage solution.

Robustness under structural uncertainty has been studied in other flavors, e.g., *demand* or *two-stage robustness* [10, 12, 14, 20] and *bulk-robustness* [1–4, 7, 21]. In all these different models, a commitment to the first-stage solution is not required. We remark that in this paper we only consider downward-closed problems. This means that a solution remains feasible even when arbitrary elements are deleted. Hence, the structural uncertainty is problematic only for the solution quality (cost) and not its feasibility. This is in contrast to the above problems but turns out interesting and challenging in our model.

The model *adjustable robustness* [6] has been proposed for solving robust LPs where commitment and adjustability can be expressed for individual variables. Related but rather different is the model of *light robustness* where some stochastic programming flavor is integrated [16].

2 Preliminaries

We consider simple undirected graphs G with node set $V(G)$ and edge set $E(G)$; we may omit G if it is clear. A *stable set* U of G is a subset of vertices $U \subseteq V(G)$ such that the induced subgraph $G[U]$ is edgeless. A *matching* M in G is a set of disjoint edges in G . A graph is *bipartite* if the vertex set can be partitioned into two disjoint sets A and B such that all edges have one endpoint in A and one in B . An *interval graph* is a graph that has an interval representation: Each vertex $v \in V$ can be associated with an interval i_v on the real line and two vertices share an edge if and only if their corresponding intervals overlap. Bipartite and interval graphs can be recognized in polynomial time.

Robust maximum-cardinality problems. Consider the unweighted version of problem (RP), where the task is to find an $S \in \mathcal{F}$ maximizing $|S - f + e|$ after the interdiction of $f \in E$ and the possible recourse of element $e \in E \setminus (S + f) \cup \emptyset$. Note that $|S'| = |S - f + e| \geq |S| - 1$. Thus, it suffices to restrict our search of S to the maximum cardinality sets in \mathcal{F} . Moreover, it suffices to consider $f \in S$. We call a solution $S \in \mathcal{F}$ of the nominal problem *repairable*, if for each $f \in S$ there exists an $e \in E \setminus S$ such that $S' = S - f + e \in \mathcal{F}$.

Observation 2.1. *Consider a robust counterpart (RP) of some Π with unit weights. Then, there is a maximum-cardinality solution S to Π that is optimal for (RP). Furthermore, if there is a maximum-cardinality solution S of Π that is repairable, then S is optimal.*

Some basics on matroids. Recall that any non-empty downward-closed set system (E, \mathcal{I}) with $\mathcal{I} \subseteq 2^E$ is a *matroid* if it satisfies the exchange property

$$\text{if } I, J \in \mathcal{I} \text{ and } |I| < |J|, \text{ then } I + g \in \mathcal{I} \text{ for some } g \in J \setminus I. \quad (3)$$

Given a matroid $\mathcal{M} = (E, \mathcal{I})$, a subset $I \subseteq E$ is called *independent* if $I \in \mathcal{I}$, and *dependent* otherwise. For $X \subseteq E$, an inclusion-wise maximal independent subset of X is called *basis* of X . Let us denote by $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{M})$ the collection of all bases of E . It follows from (3) that all bases of \mathcal{M} have the same cardinality. For an element $f \in E$, we define $\mathcal{M} - f := (E - f, \mathcal{I}')$, where $\mathcal{I}' := \{I \in \mathcal{I} \mid f \notin I\}$.

It is a well-known fact [8, Thm. 2], that a non-empty collection of sets $\mathcal{B} \subseteq 2^E$ forms the base set of a matroid if and only if the following *strong basis exchange property* is satisfied:

$$\text{If } B_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{B}, a \in B_1 \setminus B_2, \text{ then } \exists b \in B_2 \setminus B_1 \text{ with } B_1 - a + b \in \mathcal{B} \text{ and } B_2 - b + a \in \mathcal{B}. \quad (4)$$

3 Robust Matroid Basis

In this section we consider the problem (k, k) -ROBUST MATROID BASIS ((k, k) -RMB), where we are given a matroid $\mathcal{M} = (E, \mathcal{I})$ with weight function $w : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and the task is to solve (k, ℓ) -RP for $k = \ell$ with the feasibility set \mathcal{F} equal to the independent set system \mathcal{I} .

Let \mathcal{B} be the collection of bases of matroid $\mathcal{M} = (E, \mathcal{I})$. We will prove that for any weight function $w : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, any maximum weight basis in \mathcal{B} is also an optimal solution to (k, k) -RMB. We use the following lemma, which might be folkloric; we give a proof in the appendix.

Lemma 3.1. *Let B be a maximum-weight basis of \mathcal{M} and let $f \in B$. Further, let $e \in \arg \max\{w(g) \mid g \in E \setminus \{f\}, B - f + g \in \mathcal{B}\}$. Then $B + e - f$ is a max-weight basis of $\mathcal{M} - f$.*

Theorem 3.2. *Any maximum weight basis of \mathcal{M} is an optimal first-stage solution for (k, k) -ROBUST MATROID BASIS. Thus, (k, k) -ROBUST MATROID BASIS is polynomial-time solvable.*

Proof. Let S be a maximum weight basis of \mathcal{M} and let S^* be an optimal first-stage solution to RMB. Furthermore, let F be the set of elements that are deleted by the adversary in the worst-case for the first-stage solution S and let S' be its second-stage solution after the deletion of F and the recourse. Additionally, let S_F^* be the second-stage solution for the first-stage solution S^* with interdiction set F . We will show that $w(S') \geq w(S_F^*)$. Since F was the worst-case choice of the adversary for S and F could also be chosen as an interdiction set for S^* , we have that then S is also an optimal first-stage solution. Hence, it remains to prove $w(S') \geq w(S_F^*)$.

Consider the adversary and the recourse as a one-by-one process, in which the elements in F are deleted one after the other in a fixed order and after each deletion of one element (the adversary's action) one element is added to the solution (the recourse), until all elements of F have been deleted and each recourse has been added. That is, we have a fixed order of the elements in F , i.e. f_1, f_2, \dots, f_k , $f_i \in F$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$ and in step i the element f_i is deleted and an element $e_i \in E \setminus (S \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} f_j)$ is added to S such that $(S \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^i e_j) \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^i f_j$ is an independent set (or an element $e_i^* \in E \setminus (S^* \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} f_j)$ for S^* , respectively). Hence, we consider this process for both S and S^* .

In this process, one can potentially add elements from $(E \setminus S) \cap F$ that are then removed again in a later step (and the same for S^*). Furthermore, in this process, as recourse for the elements in the first-stage solution S we always add the elements from the remaining set of elements $E \setminus (S \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} f_j)$ that maximizes the weight of the resulting basis of $\mathcal{M} \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} f_j$. That is, $e_i \in \arg \max\{w(g) \mid ((S + g - f_i \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} e_j) \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} f_j) \in \mathcal{I}\}$. For the optimal first-stage solution S^* , if some element is deleted during the process, we simply add some element from the final solution S_F^* . Let S_i and S_i^* , $0 \leq i \leq k$ be the intermediate bases obtained by this process for S and S^* , respectively.

Now we invoke Lemma 3.1 and have that S_1 is a maximum weight basis of $\mathcal{M} - e_1$. Furthermore, iteratively we can now invoke Lemma 3.1 to show that S_i is a maximum weight basis of $\mathcal{M} \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^i f_j$. Hence, we have that $w(S_i) \geq w(S_i^*)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$. In particular, we now have $w(S') = w(S_k) \geq w(S_k^*) = w(S_F^*)$. Consequently, by using the polynomial-time greedy algorithm for the Matroid Basis Problem [25], we can compute an optimal first-stage solution for (k, k) -ROBUST MATROID BASIS in polynomial time. \square

Further, we show that matroids are the only downward-closed set systems for which an optimal solution to the nominal problem is also an optimal solution to its robust counterpart.

Theorem 3.3. *For every non-empty downward-closed set system $\mathcal{F} \subseteq 2^E$ which is not a matroid, there exist weights $w : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ such that the optimal solution to the nominal problem is not an optimal first-stage solution for the robust counterpart.*

Recall that a non-empty downward-closed system $\mathcal{F} \subseteq 2^E$ is not a matroid if the exchange property (3) is violated. Such *non-matroids* can be characterized via the following Lemma (see, e.g., [18] for the proof).

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq 2^E$ be a non-empty downward-closed system which is not a matroid, and let $\bar{\mathcal{F}} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ be the collection of the inclusion-wise maximal sets in \mathcal{F} . Then there exist two sets $X, Y \in \bar{\mathcal{F}}$, and three elements $\{a, b, c\} \subseteq X \Delta Y := (X \setminus Y) \cup (Y \setminus X)$ such that for each set $Z \in \bar{\mathcal{F}}$ with $Z \subseteq X \cup Y$, either $a \in Z$, or $\{b, c\} \subseteq Z$.*

Proof of Theorem 3.3. Take $X, Y \in \bar{\mathcal{F}}$, and the three elements $\{a, b, c\} \subseteq X \Delta Y$ as in the statement of Lemma 3.4. We set the weights of all elements in $E \setminus \{a, b, c\}$ to zero, and $w(a) = 3$, $w(b) = w(c) = 2$. Then the optimal first-stage solution for the (1, 1)-robust counterpart is to select either $S = \{b\}$, or $S = \{c\}$. Then, if the adversary interdicts, one can still add $\{a\}$ and achieve a second-stage value of 3. Otherwise, if the adversary does not interdict, one can extend to the optimal solution of the underlying problem $\{b, c\}$ of value 4.

In contrast, if the first-stage solution S is equal to a nominal optimal solution, then S necessarily contains $\{b, c\}$, and one can only achieve a value of 2. Because if either b or c is interdicted, one can not extend S by an element of positive value in the recourse. \square

4 Robust Bipartite Matching

In this section, we consider ROBUST BIPARTITE MATCHING (RBM), which is the problem (RP) where the feasible set \mathcal{F} is the set of matchings in the input bipartite graph G . We show that this problem is intractable even in the unweighted setting.

This is in contrast to the complexity status of the underlying problem of finding a matching which is a polynomial-time solvable problem (even in general graphs and with arbitrary weights). Further, this problem is a classical example for matroid intersection. Hence, the following result shows the drastic increase in the problem complexity when the underlying problem is finding a maximum-weight basis of the *intersection of two matroids* instead of a *single matroid*.

Theorem 4.1. ROBUST BIPARTITE MATCHING is NP-hard, even for unit edge weights.

Proof. By Observation 2.1, it suffices to show that it is NP-hard to decide whether the input graph G has a repairable matching of maximum cardinality. We refer to this problem as REPAIRABLE BIPARTITE MATCHING (REPBM) and give a reduction from 3-SAT: Given a set of Boolean variables $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$ and a formula φ in conjunctive normal form, where each clause has 3 variables, does there exist a truth assignment that satisfies φ ?

Let I be an instance of 3-SAT with a set of Boolean variables X and a set of clauses $Y = \{C_1, C_2, \dots, C_m\}$ in which each clause $C_i \subseteq X$ and $|C_i| = 3$. We construct an instance I_{REPBM} of problem REPBM with input graph $G = (V, E)$ as follows (see also Figure 1):

- For each variable $x_i \in X$ in I , we add two nodes a_i and \bar{a}_i in $V(G)$ corresponding to a positive and negative literal of x_i , respectively. We set $A := \{a_1, \dots, a_n, \bar{a}_1, \dots, \bar{a}_n\}$. Moreover, we add b_i in $V(G)$ for each $x_i \in X$ and set $B := \{b_1, \dots, b_n\}$. Additionally, for each clause $C_i \in Y$, we add two nodes c_i, z_i in $V(G)$ and set $C := \{c_1, \dots, c_m\}$ and $Z := \{z_1, \dots, z_m\}$. Finally, we have $V(G) = A \cup B \cup C \cup Z$.

- Let the edge set $E(G)$ be the union of the following set of edges.
 - For all $i \in [n]$, add $a_i b_i, \bar{a}_i b_i$ to $E(G)$.
 - For all $j \in [m]$, add $c_j z_j$ to $E(G)$.
 - If $x_i \in C_j$, then add $a_i c_j$ to $E(G)$ and if $\bar{x}_i \in C_j$, then add $\bar{a}_i c_j$ to $E(G)$.

Note that G is bipartite as $V(G)$ can be partitioned into two stable sets, $A \cup Z$ and $B \cup C$.




Figure 1: ROBUST BIPARTITE MATCHING instance obtained by reducing from a 3-SAT instance.

Given a satisfying truth assignment $\gamma : X \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ of I , we show that the matching $M = \{c_j z_j \mid j \in [m]\} \cup \{a_i b_i \mid \gamma(x_i) = 0\} \cup \{\bar{a}_i b_i \mid \gamma(x_i) = 1\}$ is a solution for I_{REPBPM} . Notice that $|M| = m + n$ as M leaves exactly n unsaturated vertices in $V(G)$. The set of these n unsaturated vertices constitutes of one element from each $\{a_i, \bar{a}_i\}$ where $i \in [n]$. These are precisely the literals with truth value 1 assigned to them by γ . All edges $e \in M$ contain either some $b_i, i \in [n]$, or some $c_j, j \in [m]$, as an endpoint. Note that M is a matching in G of maximum cardinality.

To prove that M is a solution of I_{REPBPM} , we show that for each edge $f \in M$ there is an edge $e \in E(G) \setminus M$ such that $M - f + e$ is a matching. In other words, for each edge f , there is an edge e connecting an unsaturated vertex in $V(G)$ to an endpoint of f . If f is incident to b_i , we take as e the other edge incident to b_i . If f is incident to c_j , then there is an unsaturated vertex a_i such that $a_i c_j \in E(G) \setminus M$, or an unsaturated vertex \bar{a}_i such that $\bar{a}_i c_j \in E(G) \setminus M$. This is because M is derived from the satisfying truth assignment γ of I , and clause C_j contains some literal x_i or \bar{x}_i with truth assignment 1.

Next, we show that if I_{REPBPM} is a yes-instance of REPBPM, then also I is a yes-instance of 3-SAT. If I_{REPBPM} is a yes-instance of REPBPM, then there is a matching M' of size $m + n$ in which each $f \in M'$ has an edge $e \in E(G) \setminus M'$ such that $M' - f + e$ is a matching.

First, we claim that we can assume without loss of generality that M' contains all edges in $\{c_j z_j \mid j \in [m]\}$. Assume this is not true. Then, since M' has to have size $m + n$, there must exist some edge $a_i c_j \in M'$ or some edge $\bar{a}_i c_j \in M'$. Without loss of generality, assume we are in the former case. Then we claim that $M'' = M' + c_j z_j - a_i c_j$ is also a repairable matching of cardinality $m + n$. Clearly, M'' is a matching of cardinality $m + n$. Hence, it remains to show that for each $f \in M''$ there exists some $e \in E \setminus M''$ such that $M'' - f + e$ is also a matching. First, consider some $f \in M'' \setminus \{c_j z_j\}$. In that case, set e to be some edge such that $M' - f + e$ is a matching (which exists since M' was repairable). Observe that e can not be incident to c_j (since $a_i c_j \in M'$) and also not incident to z_j (since z_j has degree 1). Hence, $M'' - f + e$ is a matching. Second, consider the

case $f = c_j z_j$. Now choose $e = a_i c_j$. Clearly, $M'' - f + e$ is a matching since $M'' - f + e = M'$. By applying this procedure iteratively to all edges $a_i c_j \in M'$, we obtain the desired result.

Now observe that all edges in M' are either of the form $c_j z_j$ for some $j \in [m]$ or of the form $a_i b_i$ or $\bar{a}_i b_i$ for some $i \in [n]$. Hence, since M' has cardinality exactly $m + n$, either a_i or \bar{a}_i , $i \in [n]$ is saturated by M' . Let $U \subseteq A$ be the set of vertices in A that are not incident to M' . Let $\gamma : X \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ where $\gamma(x_i) = 1$ if $a_i \in U$, and $\gamma(x_i) = 0$ if $\bar{a}_i \in U$. We claim that this assignment satisfies the formula φ .

For the sake of contradiction assume that γ does not satisfy φ . Then there is a clause C_j for which all three literals in C_j evaluate to 0. Now consider the corresponding vertices in the graph G ; the literals evaluate to 0 because the corresponding vertices are matched to b_i in matching M' . This implies there is no $f \in E(G) \setminus M'$ which replaces the edge $c_j z_j \in M'$. However, this contradicts the fact that M' is a solution to I_{REPBEM} . \square

5 Robust Stable Set in Bipartite Graphs

This section is devoted to the ROBUST STABLE SET (RSS) problem, which is the problem (RP) where the feasibility set \mathcal{F} is the set of all stable sets of the input graph G . In the following we consider bipartite graphs and show, somewhat surprisingly, that the unweighted problem admits an efficient algorithm. This result extends to König-Egerváry graphs. In contrast, the robust problem for line graphs of bipartite graphs is NP-hard, which is interesting given the nominal problem in those graphs is as easy as in bipartite graphs. Finally, we show that the *weighted* problem is NP-hard even in bipartite graphs.

Theorem 5.1. *Unweighted ROBUST STABLE SET is polynomial-time solvable in bipartite graphs.*

By Observation 2.1, it suffices to show that we can find a repairable stable set in bipartite graphs in polynomial time. Hence, Theorem 5.1 follows directly from the following lemma.

Lemma 5.2. *A bipartite graph G contains a repairable stable set if and only if the underlying graph contains a perfect matching and each edge in the matching has a degree one endpoint.*

Proof. Let G admit a maximum stable set $S \subseteq V(G)$ which is repairable. Then by definition, for all $v \in S$, there is a $w \in V \setminus S$ such that $S - v + w$ is also a stable set. Note that, if $w \notin N(v)$, where $N(v) := \{w \in V \mid \{v, w\} \in E\}$ is the set of neighbors of v , then $S + w$ is a stable set in contradiction to the fact that S is a stable set of maximum cardinality in G . Hence for all $v \in S$, there is a $w \in N(v)$ such that $S - v + w$ is a stable set. We call w the *backup* vertex of v . Note that $N(w) \cap S = \{v\}$. This implies that in a repairable stable set S , each vertex $v \in S$ has a distinct backup vertex w . Hence, there should be at least $|S|$ many backup vertices in the graph (one for each $v \in S$), and since the backup vertices do not belong to the stable set S , we have $|S| \leq \frac{n}{2}$. As the size of a maximum stable set in a bipartite graph is at least $\frac{n}{2}$, we have $|S| = \frac{n}{2}$. Therefore, G contains a perfect matching $M = \{vw \in E \mid v \in S, w \text{ is a backup of } v\}$. Now consider vertex $v \in S$ and its backup vertex $w \in N(v)$; w is the only neighbour of v , otherwise S is not a stable set or some vertex $u \in V \setminus S$ is not a backup vertex. Thus each $v \in S$ has degree one.

Now let us assume that G has the desired properties. We show that there is a repairable stable set in G . If the graph contains a perfect matching and every matching edge is incident to a degree one vertex, then a collection of these degree one vertices, $S \subseteq V(G)$, one from each edge in the perfect matching, is a solution of the instance of the problem. Observe that for each vertex $v \in S$, the unique neighbour w of v serves as a backup vertex. \square

Notice that the crucial properties used to prove Lemma 5.2 and Theorem 5.1 even hold for *König-Egerváry* graphs, a generalization of bipartite graphs, which are graphs in which the size of a minimum vertex cover equals the size of a maximum matching [11].

Corollary 5.3. *Unweighted ROBUST STABLE SET is polynomial-time solvable in König-Egerváry graphs.*

This is somewhat surprising in the following sense: Theorem 4.1 implies a hardness result for ROBUST STABLE SET on line graphs of bipartite graphs. A *line graph* of some graph G contains the vertex set corresponding to $E(G)$, and there is an edge between two vertices if and only if the corresponding edges share an endpoint in G . In general, a maximum stable set in a line graph of some graph G corresponds to a maximum matching in G , and hence can be computed in polynomial time. However, while Theorem 5.1 gives a polynomial-time algorithm for ROBUST STABLE SET on bipartite graphs, this one-to-one correspondence and Theorem 4.1 imply that the problem is NP-hard on line graphs of bipartite graph.

Corollary 5.4. *ROBUST STABLE SET is NP-hard in line graphs of bipartite graphs.*

The complexity of ROBUST STABLE SET in bipartite graphs changes with weights.

Theorem 5.5. *ROBUST STABLE SET is NP-hard in bipartite graphs.*

Proof. We prove that the decision variant of ROBUST WEIGHTED STABLE SET is NP-hard on bipartite graphs: Given an instance I' consisting of a graph G , weight function w and an integer k , decide if I' admits a solution of weight k or more (recap that the weight of the solution is after the interdiction and the recourse).

We give a reduction from 3-SAT. Given an instance I of 3-SAT with the set of variables $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$ and a satisfiability formula φ with clauses $Y = \{C_1, C_2, \dots, C_m\}$, we construct an instance $I' = (G, w)$ of the ROBUST WEIGHTED STABLE SET problem as follows:

- For each variable $x_i \in X$, we take vertices $a_i, \bar{a}_i, b_i, b_i^1, b_i^2$ in $V(G)$. For each clause C_i in φ , we add a vertex c_i in $V(G)$. Moreover, we add 3 representative vertices, c_i^1, c_i^2, c_i^3 , corresponding to each literal in C_i .
- The edge set $E(G)$ consists of the following set of edges:
 - (a) For all $i \in [n]$, $b_i b_i^1, b_i b_i^2, b_i^1 a_i, b_i^2 \bar{a}_i \in E(G)$
 - (b) For all $j \in [m]$, $c_j c_j^1, c_j c_j^2, c_j c_j^3 \in E(G)$
 - (c) Connect the three vertices c_i^1, c_i^2, c_i^3 to the corresponding literals in the clause, e.g. if $C_1 = (v_1 \vee \bar{v}_2 \vee v_4)$, then add edges $c_1^1 a_1, c_1^2 \bar{a}_2, c_1^3 a_4 \in E(G)$.
- For the weight function $w : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, consider $1 \ll r \ll s, r, s \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and set

$$w(v) = \begin{cases} s & \text{if } v \in \{c_j \mid j \in [m]\} \cup \{b_i \mid i \in [n]\}, \\ r & \text{if } v \in \{c_j^1, c_j^2, c_j^3 \mid j \in [m]\} \cup \{b_i^1, b_i^2 \mid i \in [n]\}, \\ 1 & \text{if } v \in \{a_i, \bar{a}_i \mid i \in [n]\}. \end{cases}$$

- Set $k = (m + n - 1)s + r + n$.

Note that the constructed graph is bipartite.

First, let us assume that φ is a yes-instance and let $\gamma : X \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ be the truth assignment. We claim that $S = \{c_j \mid j \in [m]\} \cup \{b_i \mid i \in [n]\} \cup \{a_i \mid \gamma(x_i) = 0\} \cup \{\bar{a}_i \mid \gamma(x_i) = 1\}$ is a solution to I'

of weight at least k . First, observe that S is a stable set and that $w(S) = (m+n)s + n = k + s - r$. Moreover, note that $a_i \notin S$ if and only if $\gamma(x_i) = 1$. For all $j \in [m]$, there exists a vertex $c'_j \in \{c_j^1, c_j^2, c_j^3\}$ such that c'_j corresponds to a literal a for which $\gamma(a) = 1$, and hence $a \notin S$. Thus c'_j is only connected to c_j in S . Therefore, this vertex c'_j can be a backup vertex of c_j , meaning that $S + c'_j - c_j$ is a stable set of value k . Also, with a similar argument, there is a backup vertex b_i^1 or b_i^2 for every $b_i \in S$. Thus, for each $v \in S$ of weight $w(v) = s$, there is a backup vertex v' of weight $w(v') = r$. Consequently, for each $v \in S$ there exists some $v' \in V \setminus S$ such that $w(S) + w(v') - w(v) \geq (m+n-1)s + r + n = k$, as claimed.

Next, let us assume that there is a stable set S of G such that for each $v \in S$ there is some $v' \in V \setminus S$ with $w(S) + w(v') - w(v) \geq (m+n-1)s + r + n = k$. We construct a truth assignment γ for I . Observe that S must contain all $m+n$ vertices of weight s , and none of the weight r vertices since they are all neighbors of weight s vertices. Furthermore, by the property of S , for each c_j there is a vertex $c'_j \in \{c_j^1, c_j^2, c_j^3\}$, such that the corresponding literal of c'_j , say a , is not in S , i.e., $S + c'_j - c_j$ is a stable set (2). Since for all $v \in S$ there exists some $v' \in V \setminus S$ such that $w(S) - w(v) + w(v') \geq (m+n-1)s + r + n$, set S must contain n vertices from set $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_n, \bar{a}_1, \dots, \bar{a}_n\}$. Furthermore, since for each b_i there is a vertex v' of value r such that $S + v' - b_i$ is a stable set, not both a_i and \bar{a}_i are in S . Hence, exactly one of a_i, \bar{a}_i belongs to S (1). We take the set of vertices in A which are not part of S and define the assignment $\gamma(x_i) = 1$ if and only if $a_i \notin S$. We claim that γ is a truth assignment. Clearly, by (1) γ is an assignment. Second, by (2) γ satisfies exactly the definitions of a truth assignment. \square

6 Robust Stable Set in Interval Graphs

In this section we consider ROBUST STABLE SET in interval graphs. For convenience, we use the standard interval representation of an interval graph $G = (V, E)$ where each node is represented as an interval in \mathbb{R} , and a stable set in G corresponds to a selection of disjoint intervals. We refer to the task of finding a maximum-weighted set of disjoint intervals as INTERVAL SCHEDULING (INS) and its robust counterpart as ROBUST INTERVAL SCHEDULING (RIS). Further, we refer to the intervals as *jobs* as it is common in scheduling. INS is known to be solvable in polynomial time via dynamic programming [17]. Our main result in this section is the following.

Theorem 6.1. *There is a polynomial-time algorithm for ROBUST INTERVAL SCHEDULING.*

From now on we fix some instance $\mathcal{I} = (I, w)$ of RIS, where $I = \{i_1, \dots, i_n\}$ is the set of jobs and a job i_j consists of a half open interval $[a_j, b_j)$ with $a_j, b_j \in \mathbb{N}$, $a_j \leq b_j$ for all $j \in [n]$. Let $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}(I)$ be the set of all subsets of disjoint intervals in I .

6.1 Algorithm Outline and Proof Roadmap

We outline our algorithmic approach for the proof of Theorem 6.1. As mentioned in the introduction, one can reduce the robust counterpart of some nominal problem to its bounded-regret version λ -RP. The bounded-regret version of RIS, which we denote as λ -ROBUST INTERVAL SCHEDULING (λ -RIS), is given by

$$\max_{\substack{S \in \mathcal{F} \\ \Delta(i_j, S) \leq \lambda: \forall i_j \in I \cup \emptyset}} w(S), \quad \text{where } \Delta(i_j, S) = \min_{\substack{S - i_j + i_\ell \in \mathcal{F} \\ i_\ell \in (I \setminus (S + i_j)) \cup \emptyset}} w(S) - w(S + i_\ell - i_j). \quad (\lambda\text{-RIS})$$

Here, $\Delta(i_j, S)$ defines the loss in the objective value after the recourse, when job i_j fails. Note that if $i_j \in S$, then we simply have $\Delta(i_j, S) = w(i_j) - \max_{i_\ell \in (I \setminus S) \cup \emptyset} w(i_\ell)$.

A polynomial-time algorithm for λ -ROBUST INTERVAL SCHEDULING implies a polynomial-time algorithm for RIS since the number of different possible regrets is bounded by $O(|I|^2)$. As a result, we have the following proposition.

Proposition 6.2. *A polynomial-time algorithm for λ -ROBUST INTERVAL SCHEDULING implies a polynomial-time algorithm for ROBUST INTERVAL SCHEDULING.*

Now, it remains to provide a polynomial-time algorithm for λ -RIS for some arbitrary fixed value of $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. Recall that λ corresponds to the maximum loss (regret) in the objective value if some job is deleted. Therefore, it will be convenient to hedge against regret larger than λ by defining a backup for each job j , which is a job that we would add in the recourse in case j fails and that has a weight at least $w(j) - \lambda$. We define certain types of backups, namely *private* and *universal* backups (precise definitions follow shortly). Further, we show that an optimal solution of λ -RIS contains at most one universal backup. Thus we can simply enumerate over all possible values of the universal backups to search for the one that is used in the optimal solution. There are n such possible universal backups.

We show in Section 6.2, for the correct guess of universal backup, λ -RIS can be reduced to solving a more general interval scheduling problem, which we call INTERVAL SCHEDULING WITH COLORS (ISC). As a consequence, we then prove the following theorem.

Theorem 6.3. *Given a polynomial-time algorithm for INTERVAL SCHEDULING WITH COLORS, there is a polynomial-time algorithm for λ -ROBUST INTERVAL SCHEDULING.*

Finally, in Section 6.3 we provide a dynamic program that solves INTERVAL SCHEDULING WITH COLORS in polynomial time.

Theorem 6.4. *There is a polynomial-time algorithm for INTERVAL SCHEDULING WITH COLORS.*

Proposition 6.2 combined with Theorems 6.3 and 6.4 directly imply Theorem 6.1.

Further important definitions. Let $\mathcal{F}(I)$ be a collection of feasible solutions to \mathcal{I} , and $S \in \mathcal{F}(I)$. We define, for each element $i \in I$, a *backup* element $\mathbf{b}(i, S)$:

$$\mathbf{b}(i, S) \in \underset{\substack{S+i_\ell-i \in \mathcal{F}(I) \\ i_\ell \in (I \setminus S) \cup \emptyset}}{\arg \max} w(i_\ell).$$

Informally speaking, $\mathbf{b}(i_j, S)$ is a best possible recourse when i_j is interdicted and gets added to the remaining solution $S - i_j$. Hence, $\mathbf{b}(i_j, S)$ serves as a backup for i_j .

Note that, for a job $i_j \in S$, its backup $\mathbf{b}(i_j, S) = i_{j'}$ may or may not intersect with i_j . Hence, the backup job $i_{j'}$ of i_j satisfies one of the following two conditions:

- (a) $S + i_{j'} - i_j \in \mathcal{F}(I)$, but $S + i_{j'} \notin \mathcal{F}(I)$, this occurs if $i_j \cap i_{j'} \neq \emptyset$, or
- (b) $S + i_{j'} \in \mathcal{F}(I)$, when $i_j \cap i_{j'} = \emptyset$.

In case (a) job $i_{j'}$ cannot be used as a backup for any other job $i \neq i_j$, since $i_j \in S$ and $i_j \cap i_{j'} \neq \emptyset$. Hence, we call such a backup the *private* backup of job i_j . In case (b) i_j can be used as a backup for any job $i \in I - i_{j'}$, since $i_{j'}$ does not intersect with any job $i_j \in S$, and hence we call such a backup a *universal* backup. Note that since a universal backup, say u , can be used

as a backup for any job $i \in I - u$, it is enough to have one such backup for all jobs that might not have a private backup. For a first-stage solution set S , we want a universal backup u to be in $\arg \max\{w(i_{j'}) \mid i_{j'} \in I \setminus S \text{ and } S + i_{j'} \in \mathcal{F}(I)\}$. But what happens when u is interdicted? In the case when $\lambda < 0$ and u is interdicted, if there is no recourse, the value $\Delta(u, S) = 0 > \lambda$. This contradicts the feasibility of S . To deal with this problem, we choose an *extra* backup b along with our universal backup u . In particular, we aim to have $b \in \arg \max\{w(i_{j'}) \mid i_{j'} \in I \setminus (S + u) \text{ and } S + i_{j'} \in \mathcal{F}(I)\}$. Moreover, we have $w(u) \geq w(b)$.

Finally, we give a formal definition of INTERVAL SCHEDULING WITH COLORS (ISC): In an instance $\mathcal{I}' = (I, w)$ of ISC, there is a set of jobs I and a weight function $w : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Each job i_j has two half open intervals $[\ell_j, r_j)$ and $[a_j, b_j)$ satisfying $\ell_j \leq a_j < b_j \leq r_j$. The inner interval $[a_j, b_j)$ is colored *red* and the outer part $[\ell_j, r_j) \setminus [a_j, b_j)$ is colored *blue*. A feasible solution is a subset of jobs S such that for any two jobs $i_j, i_k \in S$, we have that $[a_j, b_j)$ and $[\ell_k, r_k)$ do not intersect and that $[a_k, b_k)$ and $[\ell_j, r_j)$ do not intersect. That is, the red interval of any job in the solution is not allowed to intersect with the red or blue intervals of any other job in the solution. The task is to pick a feasible solution of maximum weight. We show in Theorem 6.4 in Section 6.3 that this problem can be solved in polynomial time.

6.2 The Algorithm for Bounded-Regret Interval Scheduling

We present an efficient algorithm for λ -ROBUST INTERVAL SCHEDULING, for some fixed λ , and thereby prove Theorem 6.3 which we restate here for convenience.

Theorem 6.3. *Given a polynomial-time algorithm for INTERVAL SCHEDULING WITH COLORS, there is a polynomial-time algorithm for λ -ROBUST INTERVAL SCHEDULING.*

Proof. To prove the theorem, we first describe the reduction from λ -ROBUST INTERVAL SCHEDULING to INTERVAL SCHEDULING WITH COLORS (ISC) and then prove its correctness.

Let $\mathcal{I} = (I, w)$ be an instance of λ -RIS. In the first step, we enumerate over all pairs of jobs $u, b \in I \cup \emptyset$ such that $w(u) \geq w(b) \geq -\lambda$, and corresponding to each such pair, we construct an instance $\mathcal{I}'_{u,b}(\lambda) = (I'_{u,b}(\lambda), w')$ of ISC.

First, fix a pair $u, b \in I \cup \emptyset$ of universal backup and the extra backup. Note that there are three cases: (i) there are no universal and extra backups, (ii) there is no extra backup, but some universal backup, or (iii) there are both universal and extra backups. From now on, for a fixed value of u, b , we describe our construction of $\mathcal{I}'_{u,b}(\lambda)$. But prior to that, we define a set $I'_{u,b}$, with weight function $w' : I'_{u,b} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Later, we prune $I'_{u,b}$ to our desired set $I'_{u,b}(\lambda)$ of instance $\mathcal{I}'_{u,b}(\lambda)$. For each job $i'_j \in I'_{u,b}$, we additionally define some value $\lambda_{u,b}(i'_j)$, which corresponds to the objective value that we lose (or gain) if job i_j fails. We need this to model the function $\Delta(i_j, S)$ in λ -RIS as well as to later prune the set $I'_{u,b}$ to $I'_{u,b}(\lambda)$. Note that, since $\lambda_{u,b}$ somehow models the $\Delta(i_j, S)$ function, the $\lambda_{u,b}$ values depend on the choice of the universal backup u . For each job $i_j \in I$, we add a set of jobs in $I'_{u,b}$ which cover all possible recourse actions for i_j .

- The first set of jobs covers the possibility of using the universal backup u as recourse. Thus, for each job $i_j \in I \setminus \{u, b\}$ in λ -RIS, we add a job i'_j to $I'_{u,b}$ in ISC with $w'(i'_j) = w(i_j)$. Moreover, the red interval of i'_j is set to $[a_j, b_j)$, which is the interval of i_j . The job i'_j does not have a blue interval. We set $\lambda_{u,b}(i'_j) = w(i_j) - w(u)$.
- The second set of jobs corresponds to the possibility of using a private backup. Thus for each ordered pair of jobs (i_j, i_k) from set $I \setminus \{u, b\}$, $i_j \neq i_k$, we add a job i_j^k to $I'_{u,b}$. We set $w'(i_j^k) = w(i_j)$ and $\lambda_{u,b}(i_j^k) = w(i_j) - w(i_k)$. Let $\ell_{j,k} := \min\{a_j, a_k\}$ and $r_{j,k} := \max\{b_j, b_k\}$. Then we define the red interval of i_j^k to be $[a_j, b_j)$ and the blue interval to be $[\ell_{j,k}, r_{j,k}) \setminus [a_j, b_j)$.

- Finally, for the universal and extra backup pair of jobs $u, b \in I$, we add the jobs i'_u and i'_b to $I'_{u,b}$ that only consists of the blue intervals corresponding to the intervals of u and b , respectively. We only add blue intervals since these jobs are only used as backups. We set $w(i'_u) = w(i'_b) = 0$, $\lambda_{u,b}(i'_u) = -w(u)$ and $\lambda_{u,b}(i'_b) = -w(b)$. We can safely assume that the universal and extra backup jobs u and b are always contained in a feasible solution of $\mathcal{I}'_{u,b}$.

This finishes the construction of set $I'_{u,b}$. Now, we define $I'_{u,b}(\lambda) := \{i'_j \in I'_{u,b} \mid \lambda_{u,b}(i'_j) \leq \lambda\}$ to include all jobs of $I'_{u,b}$ that have a $\lambda_{u,b}$ -value of at most λ . As a result we get our instance $\mathcal{I}'_{u,b}(\lambda) = (I'_{u,b}(\lambda), w')$, here w' is restricted to the set $I'_{u,b}(\lambda)$. Let $\mathcal{F}(I'_{u,b}(\lambda))$ be the set of feasible solutions of $\mathcal{F}(I'_{u,b}(\lambda))$.

In the remainder of the proof, we show that an optimal solution S^* of \mathcal{I} is in one-to-one correspondence with the optimal solution S of $\mathcal{I}'_{u,b}(\lambda)$ which maximizes the value $w'(S)$ over all $u, b \in I$. Moreover, the set S has the same weight and regret value as that of S^* . To get an intuition, first observe that all jobs in $I'_{u,b}(\lambda)$ correspond to the jobs in I ; we simply add some blue intervals to them. Blue intervals of jobs correspond to their respective backup jobs, and hence they are allowed to intersect in a chosen solution of ISC. Furthermore, note for all jobs $i'_j \in I'_{u,b}(\lambda)$ we have $\lambda_{u,b}(i'_j) \leq \lambda$, which encodes that the regret we suffer if the corresponding interval i_j is interdicted is indeed at most λ . Now, it remains to show that from an optimum solution S^* of \mathcal{I} , we can compute an optimum solution S of $\mathcal{I}'_{u,b}(\lambda)$ of the same weight, and from an optimum solution S to $\mathcal{I}'_{u,b}(\lambda)$ we can compute an optimum solution S^* to \mathcal{I} of the same weight and regret λ .

Let S^* be an optimum solution to \mathcal{I} . We now construct in polynomial time a solution to the corresponding instance $\mathcal{I}'_{u,b}(\lambda)$ of INTERVAL SCHEDULING WITH COLORS of the same weight. By definition we have that $w(i_j) - w(\mathbf{b}(i_j, S^*)) \leq \lambda$. Without loss of generality, we assume that S^* does not contain either of u or b from the chosen pair of backup values.

By construction of $\mathcal{I}'_{u,b}(\lambda)$, for each $i_m \in S^*$ that uses the universal backup u when i_m fails, there is a new job i'_m in $I'_{u,b}(\lambda)$ with $w'(i'_m) = w(i_m)$ and $\lambda_{u,b}(i'_m) = w(i_m) - w(u)$. Since $w(i_m) - w(\mathbf{b}(i_m, S^*)) \leq \lambda$, we have that $\lambda_{u,b}(i'_m) \leq \lambda$, and hence $i'_m \in I'_{u,b}(\lambda)$. We let

$$S_U := \{i'_m \mid i_m \in S^* \text{ and } i_m \text{ has a universal backup}\} .$$

Now consider any job $i_m \in S^*$ that has a private backup $i_k := \mathbf{b}(i_m, S^*)$. By construction of $I'_{u,b}(\lambda)$, there is a job $i_m^k \in \mathcal{I}'_{u,b}(\lambda)$ with $w'(i_m^k) = w(i_m)$ and $\lambda_{u,b}(i_m^k) \leq w(i_m) - w(i_k) \leq \lambda$. Hence, i_m^k is contained in $I'_{u,b}(\lambda)$. We let

$$S_P := \{i_m^k \mid i_m \in S^* \text{ and } i_m \text{ has a private backup } i_k := \mathbf{b}(i_m, S^*)\} .$$

Let $S = S_P \cup S_U \cup \{i'_u\} \cup \{i'_b\}$. We claim that S is a feasible solution to $\mathcal{I}'_{u,b}(\lambda)$. This directly follows from the definition of blue and red intervals: First, observe that all jobs in S are indeed contained in $I'_{u,b}(\lambda)$. Second, note that no two red intervals of jobs in S intersect, since S^* is a feasible solution before the failure of any job. Third, observe that no blue interval intersects with any red interval in S , as $S^* - i_m + \mathbf{b}(i_m, S^*)$ is feasible for any job $i_m \in S^*$ and its backup $\mathbf{b}(i_m, S^*)$. Fourth, observe that since we have guessed the universal and extra backups $u, b \in I$ correctly, we have that the blue intervals of i'_u and i'_b do not intersect with any red intervals. Hence, S is indeed a feasible solution to $\mathcal{I}'_{u,b}(\lambda)$. Finally, observe that $w(S^*) = w(S)$.

Next, we show how to construct in polynomial time a feasible solution to \mathcal{I} from an optimum solution to $\mathcal{I}'_{u,b}(\lambda)$ with the same weight and regret λ . Recall that $u, b \in I$ are the universal and extra backups that maximize the optimum solution value of $\mathcal{I}'_{u,b}(\lambda)$, where $w(u) \geq w(b) \geq -\lambda$. Let S be an optimal solution to $\mathcal{I}'_{u,b}(\lambda)$. Similar to before, let

$$S'_U := \{i'_m \in I'_{u,b} \mid i'_m \in S\}$$

be the set of all jobs in S that correspond to jobs without private backups (hence, they do not have blue intervals). Furthermore, let

$$S'_P := \{i_m^k \in I'_{u,b} \mid i_m^k \in S\}$$

be all jobs in S that do have a private backup.

We now construct a solution S^* to \mathcal{I} as follows. First, for each $i'_m \in S'_U$ we add i_m to S^* , where the (universal) backup of i_m is u . Note that by feasibility of S we have $w(i_m) - w(u) \leq \lambda$. Second, for each $i_m^k \in S'_P$ we add i_m to S^* , where the (private) backup of i_m is i_k . Again, note that by feasibility of S we have $w(i_m) - w(i_k) \leq \lambda$. Now observe that S^* is a feasible solution to \mathcal{I} since S is a feasible solution and hence no red intervals intersect. Furthermore, since S was feasible to $\mathcal{I}'_{u,b}(\lambda)$, the universal or private backup of any job can be added without violating feasibility.

Finally, observe that by construction of $\mathcal{I}'_{u,b}(\lambda)$ we have that

$$w(S) = w(S^*) \text{ and } w(i_m) - w(\mathbf{b}(i_m, S^*)) \leq \lambda \text{ for all } i_m \in S^*,$$

since for all $i_m \in S'_U$ we have that $w(i_m) - w(\mathbf{b}(i_m, S)) \leq \lambda$. Hence, the regret is at most λ if some element $i_m \in S^*$ is interdicted. In case no element in S^* is interdicted, note that since $w(u) \geq w(b) \geq -\lambda$, we have that either u or b is not interdicted and hence can be added for recourse. Hence, also in this case we have a regret of at most λ . This concludes the proof. \square

6.3 A Dynamic Program Solving Interval Scheduling with Colors

In this section we prove Theorem 6.4, which we restate here for convenience.

Theorem 6.4. *There is a polynomial-time algorithm for INTERVAL SCHEDULING WITH COLORS.*

Proof. We extend the classical dynamic programming algorithm for INTERVAL SCHEDULING (cf. [17] and Appendix B) to ISC.

We denote by $\mathcal{F}(I)$ the set of feasible solutions for the set of jobs in I . Let $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$ and $B = \{b_1, \dots, b_n\}$ be the sets of starting and ending points of all red intervals of the jobs, respectively. Furthermore, let $L = \{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_n\}$ and $R = \{r_1, \dots, r_n\}$ be the sets of starting and ending points of all blue intervals of the jobs, respectively. We define $T_b = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} b_i$ and $T_r = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} r_i$.

For all $t_b \in B$ and for all $t_r \in R$ define $B_{t_b, t_r} = \{i_j \in I \mid b_j = t_b \text{ and } r_j \leq t_r\}$ and $R_{t_b, t_r} = \{i_j \in I \mid r_j = t_r \text{ and } b_j \leq t_b\}$. Additionally, let $I_{t_b, t_r} = \{i_j \in I \mid b_j \leq t_b \text{ and } r_j \leq t_r\}$. Analogue to $\mathcal{F}(I)$ we also define $\mathcal{F}(I_{t_b, t_r})$.

In the algorithm, for each tuple (t_b, t_r) , $t_b \in B$, $t_r \in R$ such that $t_b \leq t_r$ we compute a maximum weight set $S \in \mathcal{F}(I_{t_b, t_r})$. We define

$$S^*(t_b, t_r) := \arg \max_{S \subseteq I_{t_b, t_r}} w(S) \quad \text{and} \quad s^*(t_b, t_r) := \max_{S \subseteq I_{t_b, t_r}} w(S).$$

Our goal is to find $S^*(T_b, T_r)$ and $s^*(T_b, T_r)$. Suppose we have computed $S^*(t_b, t_r)$ and $s^*(t_b, t_r)$ for all $t_b \leq \tau_b$ and $t_r \leq \tau_r$ for some $\tau_b \in B$ and $\tau_r \in R$ such that $\tau_b \leq \tau_r$.

Now let $t'_b := \min\{t'_b \in B \mid t'_b > \tau_b\}$ be the next time point after τ_b at which a red interval of some job i_j ends. Similarly, let $t'_r := \min\{t'_r \in R \mid t'_r > \tau_r\}$ be the next time point after τ_r at which a blue interval of some job i_j ends.

Now we obtain $S^*(t'_b, t_r)$, $s^*(t'_b, t_r)$, $S^*(t_b, t'_r)$ and $s^*(t_b, t'_r)$ as follows: if $t'_b \leq t_r$ we get

$$s^*(t'_b, t_r) = \max \left\{ s^*(t_b, t_r), \max_{i_j \in B_{t'_b, t_r}} \{s^*(a_j, \ell_j) + w(i_j)\} \right\}$$

and $S^*(t'_b, t_r)$ is the corresponding set where $s^*(t'_b, t_r)$ is attained. Similarly, we get

$$s^*(t_b, t'_r) = \max \left\{ s^*(t_b, t_r), \max_{i_j \in B_{t_b, t'_r}} \{s^*(a_j, \ell_j) + w(i_j)\} \right\}$$

and $S^*(t_b, t'_r)$ is the corresponding set where $s^*(t_b, t'_r)$ is attained.

It is straightforward to verify that the above dynamic programming algorithms produces an optimal solution in polynomial time, which proves the theorem. \square

7 Conclusion and Future Research

In this paper we introduced the new model *Recoverable Robust Optimization with Commitment* and settled the computational complexity of various combinatorial optimization problems. While we focused in our demonstration on polynomial-time solvable problems with a downward-closed feasibility set, it would be interesting to study a broader class of problems, including NP-hard problems. Problems whose feasibility set is not downward-closed pose the additional challenge that the deletion of some elements might destroy feasibility which needs to be repaired by the recourse action.

The problem with a single interdicted element seems most fundamental. Understanding the generalization to larger interdiction sets, i.e., the (k, ℓ) -robust counterpart of some problem Π stated as (k, ℓ) -RP, appears to be a natural next step. While we gave positive results for ROBUST MATROID BASIS, it would be particularly interesting whether some of the other polynomial-time solvable problems remain tractable.

Finally, the bounded-regret problem was crucial for solving ROBUST INTERVAL SCHEDULING. It remains open whether the bounded-regret version of other problems can be solved in polynomial time. Particularly interesting is ROBUST MATROID BASIS which we can solve efficiently but the complexity of the bounded-regret version is open.

References

- [1] David Adjiashvili, Felix Hommelsheim, and Moritz Mühlenhaller. Flexible graph connectivity: Approximating network design problems between 1-and 2-connectivity. *Mathematical Programming*, 192(1-2):409–441, 2022.
- [2] David Adjiashvili, Felix Hommelsheim, Moritz Mühlenhaller, and Oliver Schaudt. Fault-tolerant edge-disjoint s-t paths - beyond uniform faults. In *SWAT 2022*, volume 227 of *LIPICs*, pages 5:1–5:19. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2022.
- [3] David Adjiashvili, Sebastian Stiller, and Rico Zenklusen. Bulk-robust combinatorial optimization. *Mathematical programming*, 149:361–390, 2015.
- [4] Ishan Bansal, Joseph Cheriyan, Logan Grout, and Sharat Ibrahimpur. Extensions of the (p, q) -flexible-graph-connectivity model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.09747*, 2022.
- [5] A. Ben-Tal, L.E. Ghaoui, and A. Nemirovski. *Robust Optimization*. Princeton Series in Applied Mathematics. Princeton University Press, 2009.
- [6] Aharon Ben-Tal, Alexander Goryashko, Elana Guslitzer, and Arkadi Nemirovski. Adjustable robust solutions of uncertain linear programs. *Mathematical programming*, 99(2):351–376, 2004.

- [7] Sylvia Boyd, Joseph Cheriyan, Arash Haddadan, and Sharat Irahimpur. Approximation algorithms for flexible graph connectivity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.13298*, 2022.
- [8] Richard A Brualdi. Comments on bases in dependence structures. *Bulletin of the Australian Mathematical Society*, 1(2):161–167, 1969.
- [9] Christina Büsing. Recoverable robust shortest path problems. *Networks*, 59(1):181–189, 2012.
- [10] Lin Chen, Nicole Megow, Roman Rischke, and Leen Stougie. Stochastic and robust scheduling in the cloud. In *APPROX-RANDOM*, volume 40 of *LIPICs*, pages 175–186. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2015.
- [11] Robert W Deming. Independence numbers of graphs-an extension of the könig-egerváry theorem. *Discrete Mathematics*, 27(1):23–33, 1979.
- [12] Kedar Dhamdhere, Vineet Goyal, Ramamoorthi Ravi, and Mohit Singh. How to pay, come what may: Approximation algorithms for demand-robust covering problems. In *FOCS 2005*, pages 367–376. IEEE, 2005.
- [13] Mitre C. Dourado, Dirk Meierling, Lucia D. Penso, Dieter Rautenbach, Fabio Protti, and Aline Ribeiro de Almeida. Robust recoverable perfect matchings. *Networks*, 66(3):210–213, 2015.
- [14] Uriel Feige, Kamal Jain, Mohammad Mahdian, and Vahab Mirrokni. Robust combinatorial optimization with exponential scenarios. In *IPCO 2007*, pages 439–453. Springer, 2007.
- [15] Dennis Fischer, Tim A. Hartmann, Stefan Lendl, and Gerhard J. Woeginger. An investigation of the recoverable robust assignment problem. In *IPEC 2021*, volume 214 of *LIPICs*, pages 19:1–19:14. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2021.
- [16] Matteo Fischetti and Michele Monaci. Light robustness. *Robust and online large-scale optimization*, 5868:61–84, 2009.
- [17] Andras Frank. Some polynomial algorithms for certain graphs and hypergraphs. Proc. 5th Br. comb. Conf., Aberdeen 1975, 211-226 (1976)., 1976.
- [18] Satoru Fujishige, Michel X Goemans, Tobias Harks, Britta Peis, and Rico Zenklusen. Matroids are immune to braess’ paradox. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 42(3):745–761, 2017.
- [19] Marc Goerigk, Stefan Lendl, and Lasse Wulf. On the recoverable traveling salesman problem. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.09691*, 2021.
- [20] Anupam Gupta, Viswanath Nagarajan, and Ramamoorthi Ravi. Thresholded covering algorithms for robust and max–min optimization. *Mathematical Programming*, 146(1-2):583–615, 2014.
- [21] Felix Hommelsheim, Moritz Mühlenthaler, and Oliver Schaudt. How to secure matchings against edge failures. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 35(3):2265–2292, 2021.
- [22] Mikita Hradovich, Adam Kasperski, and Paweł Zieliński. Recoverable robust spanning tree problem under interval uncertainty representations. *Journal of Combinatorial Optimization*, 34:554–573, 2017.

- [23] Takehiro Ito, Naonori Kakimura, Naoyuki Kamiyama, Yusuke Kobayashi, and Yoshio Okamoto. A parameterized view to the robust recoverable base problem of matroids under structural uncertainty. *Operations Research Letters*, 50(3):370–375, 2022.
- [24] Adam Kasperski, Adam Kurpisz, and Paweł Zieliński. Approximating the min–max (regret) selecting items problem. *Information Processing Letters*, 113(1-2):23–29, 2013.
- [25] Joseph B Kruskal. On the shortest spanning subtree of a graph and the traveling salesman problem. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical society*, 7(1):48–50, 1956.
- [26] Thomas Lachmann, Stefan Lendl, and Gerhard J Woeginger. A linear time algorithm for the robust recoverable selection problem. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 303:94–107, 2021.
- [27] Stefan Lendl, Britta Peis, and Veerle Timmermans. Matroid bases with cardinality constraints on the intersection. *Mathematical Programming*, pages 1–24, 2021.
- [28] Christian Liebchen, Marco Lübbecke, Rolf Möhring, and Sebastian Stiller. The concept of recoverable robustness, linear programming recovery, and railway applications. *Robust and online large-scale optimization: Models and techniques for transportation systems*, pages 1–27, 2009.
- [29] Alexander Schrijver et al. *Combinatorial optimization: polyhedra and efficiency*, volume 24. Springer, 2003.

A Proof of Lemma 3.1

A *circuit* of a matroid is an inclusion-wise minimal dependent set. Recall that for any basis $B \in \mathcal{B}$ of a matroid \mathcal{M} , and any $g \in E \setminus B$, there exists a unique circuit, called $C(B, g)$, among the elements in $B \cup \{g\}$. Recall further that the collection of circuits \mathcal{C} of a matroid satisfies the following *cycle exchange property*: for any two circuits $C_1, C_2 \in \mathcal{C}$, and any $g \in C_1 \cap C_2$, there exists a circuit $C_3 \in \mathcal{C}$ with $C_3 \subseteq (C_1 \cup C_2) \setminus \{g\}$.

Furthermore, matroids are closed under the deletion operation, i.e., for any matroid $\mathcal{M} = (E, \mathcal{I})$ and any $F \subseteq E$, the system $\mathcal{M} \setminus F = (E \setminus F, \mathcal{I} \setminus F)$ with independence system $\mathcal{I} \setminus F := \{I \subseteq E \setminus F \mid I \in \mathcal{I}\}$ is again a matroid. For more details see, e.g., Schrijver [29, Chapter 39].

Lemma 3.1. *Let B be a maximum-weight basis of \mathcal{M} and let $f \in B$. Further, let $e \in \arg \max\{w(g) \mid g \in E \setminus \{f\}, B - f + g \in \mathcal{B}\}$. Then $B + e - f$ is a max-weight basis of $\mathcal{M} - f$.*

Proof. Let $B' = B + e - f$, and let B^* be a maximum weight independent set in $\mathcal{M} - e$ with $|B^* \cap B'|$ maximum. If $B' \neq B^*$, take any $a \in B^* \setminus B'$. By the strong basis exchange property there exists $b \in B' \setminus B^*$ with $B^* - a + b \in \mathcal{B}$ and $B' - b + a \in \mathcal{B}$. Therefore we have that (1) $w(a) > w(b)$, since B^* is a maximum weight basis of $\mathcal{M} - e$, and by our choice of B^* being closest to B' . Hence, $B - b + a$ cannot be a basis of \mathcal{M} , since $w(B - b + a) > w(B)$, and B was a maximum weight basis of \mathcal{M} . Therefore we have that $b \notin C(B, a)$, but $b \in C(B', a)$, where $B' = B - f + e$. This implies that $f \in C(B, a)$, and thus (2) $w(a) \leq w(e)$ by the choice of e as an element of maximum weight among those that can be feasibly exchanged with f . But then (1) and (2) together imply that $w(b) < w(e)$. Since $f \in C(B, e) \cap C(B, a)$, by the circuit exchange property, there exists a circuit $\bar{C} \subseteq (C(B, e) \cup C(B, a)) \setminus \{f\} \subseteq B - f + e + a = B' + a$. Thus, this circuit \bar{C} must be equal to the unique circuit $C(B', a)$ which contains b . It follows that $b \in C(B', a) = \bar{C} \subseteq (C(B, e) \cup C(B, a)) \setminus \{f\}$ with $b \notin C(B, a)$, implying that $b \in C(B, e)$. Summarizing, $B - b + e$ is a basis of larger weight in matroid \mathcal{M} than B , a contradiction. \square

B Classical dynamic program for Interval Scheduling

Consider some instance \mathcal{I} of Interval Scheduling with jobs $I = \{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n\}$, where each job i_j consists of an interval $[a_j, b_j]$ and some weight $w(i_j) \geq 0$. We denote by $\mathcal{F}(I)$ the set of feasible solutions of \mathcal{I} . Let $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$ and $B = \{b_1, \dots, b_n\}$ be the sets of starting and ending points of all intervals of the jobs, respectively. Without loss of generality we assume that the jobs are ordered by their ending times of their respective intervals, i.e. we have $b_i \leq b_j$ for $i \leq j$. Then, let $T = b_n$.

For all $t \in B$ define $B_t = \{i_j \in I \mid b_j = t\}$, and for all $t \in A \cup B$ $I_t = \{i_j \in I \mid b_j \leq t\}$. Analogue to $\mathcal{F}(I)$ we also define $\mathcal{F}(I_t)$.

In the algorithm, for each $t \in B$ (in an increasing fashion) we compute a maximum weight set $S \in \mathcal{F}(I_t)$. Hence, we define

$$S^*(t) := \arg \max_{S \subseteq I_t} w(S) \text{ and } s^*(t) := \max_{S \subseteq I_t} w(S) .$$

Thus, we are interested in finding $S^*(T)$ and $s^*(T)$. Suppose we have computed $S^*(t)$ and $s^*(t)$ for all $t \leq \tau$ for some $\tau \in B$.

Now let $t' := \min\{t' \in B \mid t' > \tau\}$ be the next time point after τ at which an interval of some job i_j ends. We obtain $S^*(t')$ and $s^*(t')$ as follows:

$$s^*(t') = \max \left\{ s^*(\tau), \max_{i_j \in B_{t'}} \{s^*(a_j) + w(i_j)\} \right\}$$

and $S^*(t')$ is the corresponding set where $s^*(t')$ is attained.

It is straightforward to verify that the above dynamic programming algorithms produces an optimal solution in polynomial time.