

Robust Discrete Choice Model for Travel Behavior Prediction With Data Uncertainties

Baichuan Mo^a, Yunhan Zheng^{a,*}, Xiaotong Guo^a, Ruoyun Ma^b, Jinhua Zhao^c

^aDepartment of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139

^bDepartment of Management Science and Engineering, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305

^cDepartment of Urban Studies and Planning, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 20139

Abstract

Discrete choice models (DCMs) are the canonical methods for travel behavior modeling and prediction. However, in many scenarios, the collected data for DCMs are subject to measurement errors. Previous studies on measurement errors mostly focus on “better estimating model parameters” with training data. In this study, we focus on “better predicting new samples’ behavior” when there are measurement errors in testing data. To this end, we propose a robust discrete choice model framework that is able to account for data uncertainties in both features and labels. The model is based on robust optimization theory that minimizes the worst-case loss over a set of uncertainty data scenarios. Specifically, for feature uncertainties, we assume that the ℓ_p -norm of the measurement errors in features is smaller than a pre-established threshold. We model label uncertainties by limiting the number of mislabeled choices to at most Γ . Based on these assumptions, we derive a tractable robust counterpart for robust-feature and robust-label DCM models. The derived robust-feature binary logit (BNL) and the robust-label multinomial logit (MNL) models are exact. However, the formulation for the robust-feature MNL model is an approximation of the exact robust optimization problem. The proposed models are validated in a binary choice data set and a multinomial choice data set, respectively. Results show that the robust models (both features and labels) can outperform the conventional BNL and MNL models in prediction accuracy and log-likelihood. We show that the robustness works like “regularization” and thus has better generalizability.

Keywords: Discrete choice model; Robust optimization; Data uncertainty

1. Introduction

Discrete choice models (DCMs) are widely used to describe, explain, and predict choices between two or more discrete alternatives, such as entering or not entering the labor market, or choosing between modes of transport. A DCM specifies the probability that a person chooses a particular alternative, with the probability expressed as a function of observed variables that relate to the alternatives and the person.

1.1. Preliminaries

DCMs can be derived from utility theory. Particularly, let $U_{n,i}$ be the utility that person n obtains from choosing alternative i . The person’s utility depends on many factors, some of which we observe and some not. Hence, $U_{n,i}$ can be decomposed into a part that depends on observed variables and another part with

*Corresponding author

unobserved factors. Let $\mathbf{x}_{n,i}$ be the vector of observed factors for person n with respective alternative i . In a linear form, the utility is expressed as

$$U_{n,i} = \boldsymbol{\beta}_i^T \cdot \mathbf{x}_{n,i} + \epsilon_{n,i} \quad (1)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\beta}_i$ is a corresponding vector of coefficients. $\epsilon_{n,i}$ captures the impact of all unobserved factors that affect the person’s choice. $\mathbf{x}_{n,i}$ is a vector of observed variables relating to alternative i for person n , which satisfies

$$\mathbf{x}_{n,i} = [x_n^{(k)}]_{k \in \mathcal{K}_i} \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{C} \quad (2)$$

where $x_n^{(k)}$ is the k -th element of \mathbf{x}_n and \mathcal{K}_i is the set of features for alternative i . The set of all features is as $\mathcal{K} = \cup_{i \in \mathcal{C}} \mathcal{K}_i$.

The choice of the person is designated by dummy variables $y_{n,i}$ and $\mathbf{y}_n = (y_{n,i})_{i \in \mathcal{C}_n}$ is the associated vector. $y_{n,i} = 1$ indicating person n choosing alternative i (i.e., $U_{n,i} \geq U_{n,j}, \forall j \in \mathcal{C}_n$) and $y_{n,i} = 0$ otherwise, where \mathcal{C}_n is the choice set for person n .

The most important DCM is the multinomial logit model (MNL), where $\epsilon_{n,i}$ is assumed to be i.i.d. Gumbel distribution. In this case, the probability for person n to choose alternative i is:

$$P_{n,i} = \mathbb{P}(y_{n,i} = 1) = \frac{e^{\boldsymbol{\beta}_i^T \mathbf{x}_{n,i}}}{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} e^{\boldsymbol{\beta}_j^T \mathbf{x}_{n,j}}} \quad (3)$$

Maximum likelihood estimation is usually used to estimate the MNL model to get the parameter $\boldsymbol{\beta}$, which can be expressed as the following optimization problem:

$$\max_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}_n} y_{n,i} \cdot \log(P_{n,i}(\boldsymbol{\beta})) = \max_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}_n} y_{n,i} \cdot \log \left(\frac{\exp(\boldsymbol{\beta}_i^T \mathbf{x}_{n,i})}{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} \exp(\boldsymbol{\beta}_j^T \mathbf{x}_{n,j})} \right) \quad (4)$$

where \mathcal{N} is the set of all persons. $\mathcal{C} = \cup_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \mathcal{C}_n$ is the set of all possible alternatives.

1.2. Uncertainties in data

An important usage of DCMs is to predict an individual’s behavior based on the estimated parameters from real-world data (such as surveys). However, in many scenarios, the collected data for DCMs are subject to uncertainties (such as erroneous responses, dictation errors, etc.), which are known as measurement errors (Hausman, 2001). Measurement errors may lead to biased or inconsistent estimates of model parameters, deteriorating the model’s predictive power.

Measurement errors can happen in features (i.e., \mathbf{x}_n , left-hand side variables) and labels (i.e., \mathbf{y}_n , right-hand side variables), which require different ways to address. The typical way to deal with Measurement errors in the literature is instrumental variables (Hausman, 2001). The instrumental variables are assumed to be correlated with the “true value” of the mismeasured variables but uncorrelated with error terms.

Previous literature on measurement errors usually focuses on “better estimating model parameters” with training data. However, in the real world when using the trained (or estimated) DCMs to **predict** new users (or samples) behavior, measurement errors also exist in the testing data set. This implies that an “unbiased estimation” after correcting bias may end up performing worse in the travel behavior prediction task. To the best of the authors’ knowledge, there is no prior research in the literature addressing how to train or

estimate a DCM that effectively predicts user behavior when there are data uncertainties in testing samples. Our paper will focus on this task, which differentiates us from previous econometrics studies as shown in Table 1. Specifically, our study assumes uncertainties in the testing data set and aims to improve prediction accuracy under uncertainties. While previous studies assume uncertainties in the training data set and focus on estimating unbiased model parameters with the training data.

Table 1: Comparison of this study and literature

	Task	Performance	Uncertainties
Literature	Estimate unbiased parameters	Interpretability	Training data
This study	Predict new samples	Prediction accuracy	Testing data

1.3. Organization and contributions

In this paper, we propose a robust discrete choice model framework that is able to account for data uncertainties in both features and labels. The objective is to provide a more accurate prediction of an individual’s behavior for new samples (i.e., testing data set) when there existing data errors. The model is based on a robust optimization framework that minimizes the worst-case loss over a set of uncertainty data scenarios. Specifically, for feature uncertainties, we assume that the ℓ_p -norm of the measurement errors in features is smaller than a pre-established threshold. We model label uncertainties by limiting the number of mislabeled choices to at most Γ . Based on these assumptions, we derive a tractable robust counterpart for robust-feature and robust-label DCM models. The derived robust-feature binary logit (BNL) and the robust-label MNL models are exact. However, the formulation for the robust-feature MNL model is an approximation of the exact robust optimization problem. The proposed models are validated in a binary choice data set and a multinomial choice data set, respectively. Results show that the robust models (both features and labels) can outperform the conventional BNL and MNL models in prediction accuracy and log-likelihood. We show that the robustness works like “regularization” and thus has better generalizability.

The main contribution of the paper is threefold:

- This is the first paper to deal with feature and label uncertainties in DCM using robust optimization. Different from previous econometrics papers which focused on estimating unbiased parameters, this paper concentrates on the model’s out-of-sample prediction performances.
- We drive the closed-form robust counterparts for the robust BNL and MNL models. Specifically, the formulation for robust-feature BNL robust-label MNL models is exact. For robust MNL, due to the difficulties in maximizing a convex function, we use Jensen’s inequality to approximate the original objective function, yielding a lower bound of the original maximization problem.
- We explain the good performance of robust DCM models from the aspects of both theories and experiments: the robustness works like “regularization”. They tend to shrink the scale of the estimated parameters, making the model have higher generalizability in predicting new samples with different patterns compared to the training data set.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. The literature review is presented in Section 2. In Section 3, we describe formulations and derivations of the robust-feature DCMs for binary and multinomial cases. In Section 3, we elaborate on the robust-label DCMs that are suitable for both binary and multinomial cases. We apply the proposed framework to two different data sets as case studies in Section 5. Conclusions and discussions are presented in Section 6.

2. Literature review

2.1. Measurement errors in DCM

Transportation planning and policy analysis heavily rely on travel survey data, which includes information about activity patterns, travel behaviors, and comprehensive socio-demographic profiles of the surveyed populations. However, it's crucial to acknowledge that the presence of measurement errors in survey data is not uncommon. These errors can affect various travel-related variables, including mode choice, trip duration, and travel costs, as well as socio-demographic factors such as income (Paleti and Balan, 2019). These errors present a significant challenge when utilizing DCM for the analysis of travel surveys. For instance, a Monte Carlo simulation conducted by Hausman et al. (1998) revealed that even a small rate of outcome misclassifications (e.g., 2%) can result in DCM estimates that exhibit biases ranging from 15% to 25% when the outcome is binary.

The origins of measurement errors in household surveys are multifaceted and can be attributed to several distinct sources. First, respondents may consciously choose to provide misleading information due to various motivations, including the desire to conceal certain details or to offer socially acceptable responses (Kreuter et al., 2008). For instance, research has revealed that self-employed individuals, in particular, may deliberately underreport their income by as much as 25% when participating in household surveys (Hurst et al., 2014). Second, measurement errors can stem from inadvertent misreporting by respondents. This occurs when individuals encounter difficulties in comprehending survey questions, struggle to recollect specific details from memory, or employ inappropriate decision-making heuristics (Campanelli et al., 1991). Furthermore, the precision of survey data can be intricately connected to the particular survey methods and tools utilized for data collection. For instance, individuals engaged in surveys conducted through Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) methodologies have exhibited systematic tendencies to underreport travel, underestimate travel distances, and overstate travel times, in comparison to surveys that leverage GPS-based tracking technology (Stopher et al., 2007).

DCM has been widely used for both understanding people's travel decisions and conducting activity-travel planning (Ben-Akiva and Bierlaire, 1999; Bowman and Ben-Akiva, 2001). Consequently, the presence of measurement errors within the data can potentially distort policy decisions that rely on estimation outcomes derived from compromised data. For instance, when essential travel decision factors like travel cost and time are inaccurately measured, it can yield erroneous estimates of their influence on travelers' preferences. Likewise, if mode choice is subject to mismeasurement, it may result in investments in transportation infrastructure that do not align with the genuine preferences of travelers, potentially leading to suboptimal resource allocation and inefficient utilization of public funds. Therefore, it is imperative to develop methods that account for data mismeasurements within traditional DCM.

2.2. Methods for addressing measurement errors

To address the issue of feature mismeasurement (or "uncertainty"), researchers have primarily employed two main coping strategies (Schennach, 2016). The first approach centers on the recovery of accurate, error-free values from data tainted by measurement errors. However, this method assumes prior knowledge of the measurement error distribution, which may not always align with real-world situations. For instance, some earlier studies employed Fourier transform algorithms to mitigate measurement errors while assuming the availability of known error distributions (Wang and Wang, 2011; Schennach, 2019).

The second strategy involves correcting measurement error biases by incorporating readily available auxiliary variables, which can include repeated measurements (Schennach, 2004), indicators (Ben-Moshe,

2014), or instrumental variables (Hu, 2008). The instrumental variable approach, in particular, has been widely adopted to mitigate mismeasurement problems in linear specifications (Hausman, 2001). In this approach, instrumental variables are carefully selected to serve as proxies for the imperfectly measured feature variables. They are chosen based on their lack of correlation with the measurement errors, allowing them to effectively separate the measurement errors from the estimation process for the dependent variable (Baiocchi et al., 2014). However, a significant challenge with this group of approaches is the difficulty of obtaining suitable auxiliary variables in many practical applications.

In the context of addressing label uncertainties within DCM, previous research has employed modified maximum likelihood estimators (Hausman et al., 1998; Paleti and Balan, 2019; Hausman, 2001). This approach involves the direct codification and estimation of the proportion of misclassified data using maximum likelihood estimation. Nevertheless, this method assumes that the proportion of misclassified data is fixed and can be applied to the out-of-sample data. In many scenarios, the extent of misclassification is not deterministic but falls within specific ranges.

To overcome the aforementioned limitations, we propose the application of robust optimization to handle feature and label uncertainties in DCM. Robust optimization offers a novel approach by accounting for data uncertainties within a predefined range. Unlike conventional econometric methods, robust optimization does not require prior knowledge of the error distribution or the collection of auxiliary data. Specifically, it assumes that uncertain parameters, such as measurement errors and the number of mislabeled choices, belong to an uncertainty set of possible outcomes. The optimization process is based on identifying and addressing the worst-case scenario within this uncertainty set (Gorissen et al., 2015; Bertsimas et al., 2010).

Robust optimization techniques have provided researchers with valuable tools to tackle problems involving data uncertainty across a wide array of domains, including transportation routing and scheduling (Shi et al., 2019; Sungur et al., 2008), path recommendation (Mo et al., 2023), healthcare resource allocation (Wang et al., 2019), and portfolio optimization (Fernandes et al., 2016). Notably, to the best of our knowledge, no existing studies have employed robust optimization to tackle the challenges of measurement errors in travel behavior modeling with DCMs.

Our work is closely connected to the robust classification methods proposed by Bertsimas et al. (2019), where robust optimization and logistic regression are integrated to construct classifiers that are capable of handling uncertainties in both features and labels. We draw inspiration from these approaches in terms of constructing suitable uncertainty sets and deriving robust counterparts in robust classifications. However, our work goes beyond their exclusive focus on binary classification. Instead, we contribute by developing a robust classification method applicable to multinomial logit models, allowing for effective handling of data uncertainties when outcomes have more than two categories.

3. Robustness against uncertainties in features

In this section, we consider perturbations (i.e., measurement errors) $\Delta \mathbf{x}_n$ for person n in his/her features. Without loss of generality, let us assume all alternatives use full features (i.e., $\mathbf{x}_{n,i} = \mathbf{x}_{n,j} = \mathbf{x}_n$ for all $i, j \in \mathcal{C}_n$). For any model specification, we can set corresponding parameters to zero so as to filter out undesired features in an alternative. This is equivalent to defining a parameter domain $\beta_i \in \mathcal{B}_i$, where:

$$\mathcal{B}_i = \{\beta_i \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{K}|} : \beta_i^{(k)} = 0 \text{ if the } k\text{-th feature is not used for mode } i\} \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{C} \quad (5)$$

The overall parameter domain is thus as $\mathcal{B} = \cup_{i \in \mathcal{C}} \mathcal{B}_i$. With uncertainty in features, we have

$$U_{n,i} = \beta_i^T (\mathbf{x}_n + \Delta \mathbf{x}_n) + \epsilon_{n,i} \quad (6)$$

where $\Delta \mathbf{x}_n \in \mathcal{Z}_n$ and $\mathcal{Z}_n = \{\Delta \mathbf{x}_n : \|\Delta \mathbf{x}_n\|_p \leq \rho_n\}$ is the uncertainty set.

Assume the uncertainties are independent across individuals and consider an ℓ_p -norm uncertainty:

$$\mathcal{Z} = \prod_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \mathcal{Z}_n = \prod_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \{\Delta \mathbf{x}_n : \|\Delta \mathbf{x}_n\|_p \leq \rho_n\} \quad (7)$$

Then, the robust-feature MNL can be formulated as:

$$\max_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}} \min_{\Delta \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{Z}} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}_n} y_{n,i} \cdot \log \left(\frac{\exp(\beta_i^T (\mathbf{x}_n + \Delta \mathbf{x}_n))}{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} \exp(\beta_j^T (\mathbf{x}_n + \Delta \mathbf{x}_n))} \right) \quad (8)$$

3.1. Binary logit model

The derivation of robust BNL is similar to [Bertsimas et al. \(2019\)](#)'s robust logistic regression. Consider a binary logit model (BNL) with at most two alternatives for each individual (i.e., $\mathcal{C} = \{1, 2\}$). Define $I_n \in \mathcal{C}$ as the choice for individual n , and $J_n \in \mathcal{C}$ as the counterpart (i.e., non-choice), where $y_{n,I_n} = 1, y_{n,J_n} = 0, \forall n \in \mathcal{N}$. Then the robust-feature BNL model can be reformulated as:

$$\max_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}} \min_{\Delta \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{Z}} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \log \left(\frac{1}{1 + \exp(-(\beta_{I_n} - \beta_{J_n})^T (\mathbf{x}_n + \Delta \mathbf{x}_n))} \right) \quad (9)$$

The inner minimization problem is:

$$\min_{\Delta \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{Z}} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} -\log \left(1 + \exp(-(\beta_{I_n} - \beta_{J_n})^T (\mathbf{x}_n + \Delta \mathbf{x}_n)) \right) \quad (10)$$

$$\iff \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \min_{\Delta \mathbf{x}_n \in \mathcal{Z}_n} -\log \left(1 + \exp(-(\beta_{I_n} - \beta_{J_n})^T (\mathbf{x}_n + \Delta \mathbf{x}_n)) \right) \quad (11)$$

Let $s_n = (\beta_{I_n} - \beta_{J_n})^T (\mathbf{x}_n + \Delta \mathbf{x}_n)$, and define $g(s_n) = -\log(1 + \exp(-s_n))$. Notice that $g(s_n)$ is strictly increasing with the increase in s_n . Hence, for each $n \in \mathcal{N}$, to minimize the objective function in Eq. 11, we only need to minimize the following:

$$\min_{\|\Delta \mathbf{x}_n\|_p \leq \rho_n} -(\beta_{I_n} - \beta_{J_n})^T (\mathbf{x}_n + \Delta \mathbf{x}_n) \quad \forall n \in \mathcal{N} \quad (12)$$

Lemma 1 (Dual norm). *Let \mathbf{x} be a vector. $\|\mathbf{x}\|_p$ is the ℓ_p norm of \mathbf{x} . Then, for any given vector \mathbf{v} , the dual norm problem is:*

$$\max_{\|\mathbf{x}\|_p \leq \rho} \{\mathbf{v}^T \mathbf{x}\} = \rho \cdot \|\mathbf{v}\|_q, \quad \min_{\|\mathbf{x}\|_p \leq \rho} \{\mathbf{v}^T \mathbf{x}\} = -\rho \cdot \|\mathbf{v}\|_q \quad (13)$$

where $\|\cdot\|_q$ is called the dual norm of $\|\cdot\|_p$ and $\frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{p} = 1$

According to Lemma 1, the optimal objective function of Eq. 12 is

$$\min_{\|\Delta \mathbf{x}_n\|_p \leq \rho_n} -(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{I_n} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{J_n})^T (\mathbf{x}_n + \Delta \mathbf{x}_n) = -(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{I_n} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{J_n})^T \mathbf{x}_n + \rho_n \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_{I_n} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{J_n}\|_q \quad (14)$$

where $\frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{p} = 1$.

Substituting the optimal value into Eq. 11, the robust binary logit model becomes:

$$\max_{\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathcal{B}} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} -\log \left(1 + \exp \left(-(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{I_n} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{J_n})^T \mathbf{x}_n + \rho_n \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_{I_n} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{J_n}\|_q \right) \right) \quad (15)$$

$$\iff \max_{\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathcal{B}} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \log \left(\frac{\exp(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{I_n}^T \mathbf{x}_n)}{\exp(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{I_n}^T \mathbf{x}_n) + \exp(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{J_n}^T \mathbf{x}_n + \rho_n \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_{I_n} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{J_n}\|_q)} \right) \quad (16)$$

Remark 1. Compared to the nominal BNL, the feature-robust counterpart of BNL model has an additional $\rho_n \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_{I_n} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{J_n}\|_q$ term in the exponent of the logit function (Eq. 15). It resembles the ℓ_q -regularization term in typical machine learning problems (such as logistic regression). However, the additional term from robustness penalizes model complexity in the log odds ratio, whereas the typical regularization term is a linear penalty on the entire likelihood.

To see the connections between the robust BNL and typical regularization in machine learning, we can take the first-order Taylor approximation of Eq. 15. Define:

$$h_n(z) = -\log \left(1 + \exp \left(-(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{I_n} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{J_n})^T \mathbf{x}_n + z \right) \right) \quad (17)$$

Then the first-order Taylor approximation of $h_n(z)$ at $z = 0$ is

$$h_n(z) \approx -\log \left(1 + \exp \left(-(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{I_n} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{J_n})^T \mathbf{x}_n \right) \right) - \frac{\exp \left(-(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{I_n} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{J_n})^T \mathbf{x}_n \right)}{1 + \exp \left(-(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{I_n} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{J_n})^T \mathbf{x}_n \right)} \cdot z \quad (18)$$

Substitute $z = \rho_n \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_{I_n} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{J_n}\|_q$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & -\log \left(1 + \exp \left(-(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{I_n} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{J_n})^T \mathbf{x}_n + z \right) \right) \\ & \approx \log \left(\frac{\exp(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{I_n}^T \mathbf{x}_n)}{\exp(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{I_n}^T \mathbf{x}_n) + \exp(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{J_n}^T \mathbf{x}_n)} \right) - \frac{\exp \left(-(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{I_n} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{J_n})^T \mathbf{x}_n \right)}{1 + \exp \left(-(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{I_n} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{J_n})^T \mathbf{x}_n \right)} \cdot \rho_n \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_{I_n} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{J_n}\|_q \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Therefore, when $\rho_n \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_{I_n} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{J_n}\|_q$ is small and $\frac{\exp \left(-(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{I_n} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{J_n})^T \mathbf{x}_n \right)}{1 + \exp \left(-(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{I_n} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{J_n})^T \mathbf{x}_n \right)} \approx 1$, the robust BNL is approximately equivalent to the ℓ_q regularization in machine learning problems.

Remark 2. When $\rho_n = 0$, the feature-robust BNL will fall back to the conventional BNL model. When $\rho_n = +\infty$, the optimal value will be achieved when $\|\boldsymbol{\beta}_{I_n} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{J_n}\|_q = 0, \forall n \in \mathcal{N}$ (i.e., $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{I_n} = \boldsymbol{\beta}_{J_n}$). In DCM, a feature is actually only put in one alternative for estimation purposes (i.e., $\beta_i^{(k)} = 0$ or $\beta_j^{(k)} = 0$ for a feature $k \in \mathcal{K}, i, j \in \mathcal{C}$). Therefore, $\rho_n = +\infty$ will force the estimated $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ to be 0.

An extension of the robust BNL model is to consider a more general uncertainty set $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$ with multiple

norm constraints. Let the set of all norm constraints be \mathcal{P} , then

$$\tilde{\mathcal{Z}} = \prod_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \prod_{i \in \mathcal{P}} \{\Delta \mathbf{x}_n : \|\Delta \mathbf{x}_n\|_{p_i} \leq \rho_n^{(i)}\} \quad (20)$$

Lemma 2 (Dual norm with multiple constraints). *Let \mathbf{x} be a vector. $\|\mathbf{x}\|_p$ is the ℓ_p norm of \mathbf{x} . Then, for any given vector \mathbf{v} , the dual norm problem with multiple constraints is:*

$$\max_{\mathbf{x} \in \prod_{i \in \mathcal{P}} \{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{p_i} \leq \rho^{(i)}\}} \{\mathbf{v}^T \mathbf{x}\} = \min_{\mathbf{v}_i} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{P}} \rho^{(i)} \cdot \|\mathbf{v}_i\|_{q_i} \quad \text{s.t.} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbf{v}_i = \mathbf{v}, \quad (21)$$

$$\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \prod_{i \in \mathcal{P}} \{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{p_i} \leq \rho^{(i)}\}} \{\mathbf{v}^T \mathbf{x}\} = \max_{\mathbf{v}_i} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{P}} -\rho^{(i)} \cdot \|\mathbf{v}_i\|_{q_i} \quad \text{s.t.} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbf{v}_i = \mathbf{v} \quad (22)$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{q_i}$ is called the dual norm of $\|\cdot\|_{p_i}$ and $\frac{1}{q_i} + \frac{1}{p_i} = 1, \forall i \in \mathcal{P}$

Therefore Eq. 12 with multiple uncertainty constraints can be reformulated as

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{\prod_{i \in \mathcal{P}} \{\Delta \mathbf{x}_n : \|\Delta \mathbf{x}_n\|_{p_i} \leq \rho_n^{(i)}\}} -(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{I_n} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{J_n})^T (\mathbf{x}_n + \Delta \mathbf{x}_n) \\ & = \max_{\mathbf{w}_n^{(i)}} -(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{I_n} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{J_n})^T \mathbf{x}_n + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{P}} \rho_n^{(i)} \|\mathbf{w}_n^{(i)}\|_{q_i}, \quad \text{s.t.} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbf{w}_n^{(i)} = \boldsymbol{\beta}_{I_n} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{J_n} \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

where $\frac{1}{q_i} + \frac{1}{p_i} = 1, \forall i \in \mathcal{P}$. The final robust binary logit model with multiple uncertainty constraints becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathcal{B}, \mathbf{w}} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \log \left(\frac{\exp(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{I_n}^T \mathbf{x}_n)}{\exp(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{I_n}^T \mathbf{x}_n) + \exp(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{J_n}^T \mathbf{x}_n + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{P}} \rho_n^{(i)} \|\mathbf{w}_n^{(i)}\|_{q_i})} \right) \\ & \text{s.t.} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbf{w}_n^{(i)} = \boldsymbol{\beta}_{I_n} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{J_n} \quad \forall n \in \mathcal{N} \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

3.2. Multinomial logit model

The robustification of the multinomial logit model (MNL) is more difficult than the binary model. The inner maximization problem of the robust MNL is equivalent to ‘‘maximizing a convex function’’. For the robust BNL model, the convex function is monotonically increasing, which leads to a direct simplification of the problem. However, the MNL model cannot be simplified in a similar way. In this study, we approximate the robust MNL problem using Jensen’s inequality, which results in a similar formulation as the robust BNL model.

Similarly, let $I_n \in \mathcal{C}_n$ be the choice index for individual n . Replacing the objective function of Eq. 8 by t , we have:

$$\max_{\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathcal{B}, t} t \quad (25a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \min_{\Delta \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{Z}} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \left[-\log \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} \exp((\boldsymbol{\beta}_j - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{I_n})^T (\mathbf{x}_n + \Delta \mathbf{x}_n)) \right) \right] \geq t \quad (25b)$$

Since the uncertainty sets are independent across individuals, similar to Eq. 11, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{\Delta \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{Z}} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} -\log \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} \exp((\beta_j - \beta_{I_n})^T (\mathbf{x}_n + \Delta \mathbf{x}_n)) \right) \geq t \\ \iff & \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \min_{\Delta \mathbf{x}_n \in \mathcal{Z}_n} -\log \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} \exp((\beta_j - \beta_{I_n})^T (\mathbf{x}_n + \Delta \mathbf{x}_n)) \right) \geq t \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

For each individual n , Eq. 26 can be reformulate as:

$$\max_{\Delta \mathbf{x}_n \in \mathcal{Z}_n} \log \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} \exp((\beta_j - \beta_{I_n})^T (\mathbf{x}_n + \Delta \mathbf{x}_n)) \right) \leq -t \quad (27)$$

Note that we eliminate the negative sign and change the formulation to a maximization problem.

Consider the inner maximization problem in Eq. 27, according to the Jensen's inequality, we have:

$$\max_{\Delta \mathbf{x}_n \in \mathcal{Z}_n} \log \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} \exp((\beta_j - \beta_{I_n})^T (\mathbf{x}_n + \Delta \mathbf{x}_n)) \right) \leq \log \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} \exp \left(\max_{\Delta \mathbf{x}_n \in \mathcal{Z}_n} (\beta_j - \beta_{I_n})^T (\mathbf{x}_n + \Delta \mathbf{x}_n) \right) \right) \quad (28)$$

With the same derivation as Eq. 14, we now have:

$$\max_{\|\Delta \mathbf{x}_n\|_p \leq \rho_n} (\beta_j - \beta_{I_n})^T (\mathbf{x}_n + \Delta \mathbf{x}_n) = (\beta_j - \beta_{I_n})^T \mathbf{x}_n + \rho_n \|\beta_j - \beta_{I_n}\|_q \quad (29)$$

where $\frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{p} = 1$. Therefore, Eq. 27 can be approximated as:

$$\log \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} \exp \left((\beta_j - \beta_{I_n})^T \mathbf{x}_n + \rho_n \|\beta_j - \beta_{I_n}\|_q \right) \right) \leq -t \quad (30)$$

And the approximation of the robust-feature DCM can be reformulated as:

$$\max_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \log \left(\frac{\exp(\beta_{I_n}^T \mathbf{x}_n)}{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} \exp(\beta_j^T \mathbf{x}_n + \rho_n \|\beta_j - \beta_{I_n}\|_q)} \right) \quad (31)$$

It has a similar form as the robust BNL model (Eq. 16). However, robust BNL is an exact robust counterpart while robust MNL is an approximation.

Remark 3. The solution of Eq. 31 is a lower bound of the original robust MNL problem (Eq. 8). The reason is that, Constraint 30 is more restricted than the original constraint (Eq. 27), which gives a smaller feasible region. Therefore, the optimal objective function in Eq. 31 is smaller than that in Eq. 8 (i.e., lower bound for a maximization problem).

Similar to the extension of Robust BNL, for a general uncertainty set $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$ (Eq. 20), the robust MNL

problem is:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}, \mathbf{w}} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \log \left(\frac{\exp(\beta_{I_n}^T \mathbf{x}_n)}{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} \exp(\beta_j^T \mathbf{x}_n + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{P}} \rho_n^{(i)} \|\mathbf{w}_n^{(i,j)}\|_q)} \right) \\
& \text{s.t. } \sum_{i \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbf{w}_n^{(i,j)} = \beta_j - \beta_{I_n} \quad \forall n \in \mathcal{N}, \forall j \in \mathcal{C}_n
\end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

Another way to solve the robust MNL is to approximate the original problem to a robust linear optimization over a convex set using conjugate function and outer approximation. We describe the detailed methodology in [Appendix A](#). However, due to its difficulties in implementation, we do not apply it to the case study.

4. Robustness against uncertainties in labels

Section 3 discusses the possible uncertainties in features (i.e., $\Delta \mathbf{x}$). The measurement errors may also apply to labels or individual choices (i.e., $\Delta \mathbf{y}$). In this study, we consider the following uncertainty set:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{U}(\Gamma) = \{ \Delta \mathbf{y} : & \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} \Delta y_{n,j} = 0, \Delta y_{n,I_n} \in \{0, -1\}, \forall n \in \mathcal{N}; \\
& \Delta y_{n,j} \in \{0, 1\} \forall j \in \mathcal{C}_n \setminus \{I_n\}, \forall n \in \mathcal{N}; \\
& \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} -\Delta y_{n,I_n} \leq \Gamma \}
\end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

Specially, if $\Delta y_{n,I_n} = -1$ and $\Delta y_{n,j} = 1$, it means that the individual's actual choice is $I_n \in \mathcal{C}_n$ but the data mislabeled it as $j \in \mathcal{C}_n \setminus \{I_n\}$. The uncertainty set \mathcal{U} represents that there are at most Γ mislabeled samples. Then the robust DCM problem against feature uncertainty can be represented as:

$$\max_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}} \min_{\Delta \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{U}(\Gamma)} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}_n} (y_{n,i} + \Delta y_{n,i}) \cdot \log(P_{n,i}(\beta)) \tag{34}$$

The formulation is general for both BNL and MNL cases. Consider the convex hull of $\mathcal{U}(\Gamma)$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Conv}(\mathcal{U}(\Gamma)) = \{ \Delta \mathbf{y} : & \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} \Delta y_{n,j} = 0, -1 \leq \Delta y_{n,I_n} \leq 0, \forall n \in \mathcal{N}; \\
& 0 \leq \Delta y_{n,j} \leq 1 \forall j \in \mathcal{C}_n \setminus \{I_n\}, \forall n \in \mathcal{N}; \\
& \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} -\Delta y_{n,I_n} \leq \Gamma \}
\end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

Because the inner minimization problem is linear in $\Delta \mathbf{y}$. And the extreme points for $\text{Conv}(\mathcal{U}(\Gamma))$ are integers. Hence, the original inner minimization problem on $\mathcal{U}(\Gamma)$ is equivalent to minimizing over its

convex hull:

$$\min_{\Delta \mathbf{y}} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}_n} (y_{n,i} + \Delta y_{n,i}) \cdot \log(P_{n,i}(\boldsymbol{\beta})) \quad (36a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \Delta y_{n,I_n} + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n \setminus \{I_n\}} \Delta y_{n,j} = 0, \quad \forall n \in \mathcal{N} \quad (36b)$$

$$0 \leq -\Delta y_{n,I_n} \leq 1, \quad \forall n \in \mathcal{N} \quad (36c)$$

$$0 \leq \Delta y_{n,j} \leq 1, \quad \forall n \in \mathcal{N}, \forall j \in \mathcal{C}_n \setminus \{I_n\} \quad (36d)$$

$$\sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} -\Delta y_{n,I_n} \leq \Gamma \quad (36e)$$

By strong duality, the optimal solution in Eq. 36 equals that of its dual problem

$$\max_{\boldsymbol{\eta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, C} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}_n} y_{n,i} \cdot \log(P_{n,i}(\boldsymbol{\beta})) + \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}_n} \eta_{n,i} + \Gamma \cdot C \quad (37a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } -\gamma_n + \eta_{n,I_n} + C \leq \log(P_{n,I_n}(\boldsymbol{\beta})), \quad \forall n \in \mathcal{N} \quad (37b)$$

$$\gamma_n + \eta_{n,j} \leq \log(P_{n,j}(\boldsymbol{\beta})), \quad \forall n \in \mathcal{N}, \forall j \in \mathcal{C}_n \setminus \{I_n\} \quad (37c)$$

$$\eta_{n,i} \leq 0, \quad \forall n \in \mathcal{N}, i \in \mathcal{C}_n \quad (37d)$$

$$C \leq 0 \quad (37e)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = (\gamma_n)_{n \in \mathcal{N}}$, $\boldsymbol{\eta} = (\eta_{n,i})_{n \in \mathcal{N}, i \in \mathcal{C}_n}$, and C are dual decision variables.

The final formulation is just a combination of the inner and outer problems:

$$\max_{\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathcal{B}, \boldsymbol{\eta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, C} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \log \left(\frac{\exp(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{I_n}^T \mathbf{x}_n)}{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} \exp(\boldsymbol{\beta}_j^T \mathbf{x}_n)} \right) + \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}_n} \eta_{n,i} + \Gamma \cdot C \quad (38a)$$

$$\text{s.t. Constraints } 37b \sim 37e \quad (38b)$$

This problem has a twice continuously differentiable concave objective function and constraints, making it tractably solvable with an interior point method.

Remark 4. when $\Gamma = 0$, the optimal solution for $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ is 0 because $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ and C become free variables. Then constraints 37b and 37c do not restrict $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ to take its maximum value. Therefore, when $\Gamma = 0$ (i.e., no uncertainty), Eq. 38 is equivalent to the nominal MNL model, which validates the formulation. When $\Gamma = +\infty$, looking at the original inner minimization problem in Eq. 37, the optimal solutions for the inner minimization for a given $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is

$$\Delta y_{n,j^*} = 1, \Delta y_{n,I_n} = -1 \quad \text{if } P_{n,I_n}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) > P_{n,j^*}(\boldsymbol{\beta}), \text{ where } j^* = \arg \min_j \{P_{n,j}, j \in \mathcal{C}_n \setminus \{I_n\}\} \quad (39a)$$

$$\Delta y_{n,j} = 0, \forall j \in \mathcal{C}_n \quad \text{Otherwise} \quad (39b)$$

This is because we wish to minimize $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}_n} \Delta y_{n,i} \cdot \log(P_{n,i}(\boldsymbol{\beta})) \forall n \in \mathcal{N}$. And from the constraints we need either have $(\Delta y_{n,j} = 0, \forall j \in \mathcal{C}_n)$ or $(\Delta y_{n,I_n} = -1, \Delta y_{n,j} = 1, j \neq I_n)$. Define

$$Z_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \min_{\Delta \mathbf{y}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}_n} \Delta y_{n,i} \cdot \log(P_{n,i}(\boldsymbol{\beta})) \quad \text{s.t. Constraints } 36b \sim 36d \quad (40)$$

The objective function for the robust-label MNL is essentially

$$\max_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}} \left(\sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}_n} y_{n,i} \cdot \log(P_{n,i}(\beta)) \right) + \left(\sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} Z_n(\beta) \right) \quad (41)$$

When $\Gamma = +\infty$, the maximal value of $Z_n(\beta)$ is achieved at $\beta = 0$ because in this case, $P_{n,i} = P_{n,j}, \forall i, j \in \mathcal{C}_n$. Then Eq. 39b will always be the solution for the inner minimization problem and there are no difference terms in $Z_n(\beta)$, which leads to the maximal value of $Z_n(\beta)$ as 0. We also know that the optimal β for the log-likelihood component in Eq. 41 (i.e., left part) is the solution of the traditional MNL model. Therefore, when $\Gamma = +\infty$, the optimal values of β will be something in the middle of 0 and the solutions of MNL. This implies that with the increased value of Γ , we may observe a shrinkage of the scale of β .

5. Numerical Experiments

5.1. Experiments design

5.1.1. Binary case study

The robust BNL is evaluated on the Singapore first- and last-mile travel mode choice data set (Mo et al., 2018). The data set is part of Singapore’s Household Interview Travel Survey (HITS) in 2012. The survey collects information on travel characteristics as well as individual sociodemographics. The first and last-mile trips are extracted from the whole trip train in the HITS. Besides travel characteristics, the built environment information is also included as they highly impact the mode choices. Data collection details can be found in Mo et al. (2018). The alternative travel modes for the first/last mile trips are walk and bus.

The whole data set contains a total of more than 24,000 observations. In the case study, we randomly select 1,000 samples as the training data set and another 1,000 samples as the testing set. Denote the raw training and testing data set as $\mathcal{D}^{\text{Train}}$ and $\mathcal{D}^{\text{Test}}$, respectively. In order to simulate data uncertainties, we generate the synthetic testing data set with errors as the following:

- Step 1: Train a conventional BNL model in $\mathcal{D}^{\text{Test}}$ and assume that the obtained parameters β^{Test} is the “true” behavior mechanism that individuals will follow.
- Step 2: For each individual n in the testing data set, generate the synthetic choice \hat{y}_n based on x_n and β^{Test} (i.e., calculate the choice probabilities and randomly select one alternative based on the probabilities).
- Step 3: Add artificial errors to the generated data to get the final synthetic testing set with errors: $\tilde{y}_n = \hat{y}_n + \Delta y$ and $\tilde{x}_n = x_n + \Delta x$. Let the synthetic testing data set with errors be $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\text{Test}}$.

Specifically, the random errors Δx and Δy are generated as follows. Δx are drawn from a uniform distribution $U[-0.3\bar{x}, 0.3\bar{x}]$, where $\bar{x} = \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} x_n / |\mathcal{N}|$ is the average value of features (i.e., we perturb the features by maximally 30%). Δy is a perturbation to the labels such that with 10% probability, the label y_n is replaced by a randomly-selected alternative in \mathcal{C}_n .

All models will be trained or estimated in the training data set $\mathcal{D}^{\text{Train}}$, and tested in the synthetic testing data $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\text{Test}}$ to evaluate their performances. The data generation process is replicated for 30 times and all models are trained and evaluated in those 30 replications to reduce the impact of randomness.

5.1.2. Multinomial case study

The robust MNL is evaluated on the Swissmetro stated preference survey data set (Bierlaire et al., 2001). The survey aims to analyze the impact of travel modal innovation in transportation, represented by the Swissmetro, a revolutionary maglev underground system, against the usual transport modes represented by car and train. The data contains 1,004 individuals with 9,036 responses. Users are asked to select from three travel modes (train, car, and Swissmetro) given the corresponding travel attributes. The training and testing data set are generated in the same way as the binary case study with 1,000 randomly selected samples for both training and testing data sets.

5.2. Results

5.2.1. Binary case study

In the case study, we set $p = 2$, thus q also equals 2. The final robustness term for robust BNL model (Eq. 16) is $\rho_n \|\beta_{I_n} - \beta_{J_n}\|_2$. We also assume all individuals have the same uncertainty budget ρ_n (i.e., $\rho_n = \rho_m$ for all $n, m \in \mathcal{N}$). Table 2 shows the training and testing accuracy and log-likelihood (LL) with respect to different values of ρ_n and Γ .

Table 2: Results for robust BNL models

Model	Parameters	Training accuracy	Training LL	Testing accuracy	Testing LL
Binary Logit	-	0.957 (± 0.010)	-152.6 (± 22.6)	0.879 (± 0.014)	-358.0 (± 77.1)
Robust-feature	$\rho_n = 0.001$	0.957 (± 0.010)	-152.6 (± 22.6)	0.880 (± 0.013)	-353.8 (± 75.5)
	$\rho_n = 0.01$	0.957 (± 0.010)	-153.1 (± 22.5)	0.884 (± 0.014)	-337.5 (± 67.6)
	$\rho_n = 0.1$	0.951 (± 0.009)	-163.3 (± 22.0)	0.890 (± 0.012)	-289.3 (± 33.0)
	$\rho_n = 0.2$	0.940 (± 0.008)	-188.8 (± 21.8)	0.888 (± 0.011)	-273.2 (± 21.9)
	$\rho_n = 0.3$	0.932 (± 0.008)	-230.7 (± 21.7)	0.883 (± 0.012)	-287.3 (± 19.0)
Robust-label	$\Gamma = 1$	0.954 (± 0.009)	-157.4 (± 21.6)	0.881 (± 0.012)	-313.7 (± 43.8)
	$\Gamma = 1.5$	0.954 (± 0.009)	-160.3 (± 21.2)	0.882 (± 0.012)	-307.4 (± 38.4)
	$\Gamma = 2$	0.953 (± 0.009)	-163.6 (± 20.9)	0.881 (± 0.011)	-303.8 (± 34.1)
	$\Gamma = 2.5$	0.953 (± 0.009)	-167.0 (± 20.6)	0.879 (± 0.011)	-302.3 (± 31.9)
	$\Gamma = 3$	0.952 (± 0.009)	-170.5 (± 20.4)	0.878 (± 0.012)	-301.7 (± 30.5)

- All results are the average values of 30 replications. Values in the parentheses are standard deviations
- Best models are highlighted with gray cells

We find that, with larger values of ρ_n and Γ , the training accuracy keeps decreasing and training LL becomes smaller, showing worse goodness of fit in the training data set. This is as expected as the objective functions are weighted more on the robustness term. However, in the testing set, the both robust feature and label models perform better than the typical binary logit model. The best robust feature BNL ($\rho_n = 0.1$) has a testing accuracy of 0.890 and the best robust label BNL ($\Gamma = 1.5$) has a testing accuracy of 0.882, while the binary logit model's testing accuracy is 0.879. The improvement of testing LL is even higher for robust models.

The estimated β values of selected features are compared in Table 3. Walk time and bus in-vehicle time (IVT) are alternative-specific variables. Walking is set as the base mode. Hence, the alternative specific constant (ASC bus), distance to subway station (Dis. to sub.), and bus station accessibility (Bus access.) are only put in the utility function of the bus. We find that the estimated β of the robust-label DCM works like

“regularization”, which shrinks the estimated β value towards 0 (compared to the binary logit model) as we expected in Remark 2. This explains the good performance for out-of-sample prediction for the robust BNL model: To achieve robustness under data uncertainties, the model tends to estimate “smaller” (absolute) values of β . The “smaller” β has better generalizability towards predicting samples that have different patterns with the training data set. This mechanism is similar to how regularization works in machine learning studies.

Table 3: Selected estimated β for robust BNL models

Model	Parameters	Walk time	Bus IVT	Dist. to sub.	Bus access.	ASC bus
Binary Logit	-	-3.21 (± 0.56)	-5.29 (± 1.11)	6.17 (± 1.61)	0.95 (± 0.91)	-6.97 (± 2.36)
Robust-feature	$\rho_n = 0.001$	-3.21 (± 0.55)	-5.29 (± 1.11)	6.15 (± 1.60)	0.92 (± 0.89)	-6.72 (± 2.25)
	$\rho_n = 0.01$	-3.19 (± 0.52)	-5.19 (± 1.06)	5.98 (± 1.54)	0.69 (± 0.78)	-5.35 (± 1.58)
	$\rho_n = 0.1$	-3.10 (± 0.30)	-3.79 (± 0.65)	3.90 (± 0.84)	-0.48 (± 0.25)	-2.54 (± 0.57)
	$\rho_n = 0.2$	-2.62 (± 0.23)	-2.32 (± 0.33)	2.19 (± 0.34)	-0.70 (± 0.11)	-1.39 (± 0.25)
	$\rho_n = 0.3$	-1.93 (± 0.16)	-1.33 (± 0.17)	1.32 (± 0.15)	-0.56 (± 0.07)	-0.80 (± 0.12)
Robust-label	$\Gamma = 1$	-2.79 (± 0.45)	-3.99 (± 0.73)	4.52 (± 1.03)	0.80 (± 0.61)	-6.05 (± 1.69)
	$\Gamma = 1.5$	-2.63 (± 0.41)	-3.68 (± 0.66)	4.11 (± 0.93)	0.78 (± 0.58)	-5.88 (± 1.64)
	$\Gamma = 2$	-2.50 (± 0.38)	-3.44 (± 0.60)	3.77 (± 0.86)	0.77 (± 0.58)	-5.72 (± 1.61)
	$\Gamma = 2.5$	-2.39 (± 0.36)	-3.23 (± 0.56)	3.49 (± 0.80)	0.77 (± 0.57)	-5.69 (± 1.51)
	$\Gamma = 3$	-2.30 (± 0.35)	-3.06 (± 0.52)	3.25 (± 0.76)	0.76 (± 0.57)	-5.61 (± 1.44)

- All results are the average values of 30 replications. Values in the parentheses are standard deviations

5.3. Multinomial case study

Similar to the binary case study, we set $p = 2$ (thus $q = 2$) and make the robustness term for the robust MNL model (Eq. 31) be $\rho_n \|\beta_j - \beta_{I_n}\|_2$. The results in terms of different values of ρ_n and Γ are shown in Table 4. Note that the parameter sets are different from the binary case study as the data sets are different.

Table 4: Results for robust MNL models

Model	Parameters	Training accuracy	Training LL	Testing accuracy	Testing LL
MNL	-	0.591 (± 0.014)	-871.5 (± 15.3)	0.540 (± 0.021)	-988.5 (± 41.5)
Robust-feature	$\rho_n = 0.001$	0.590 (± 0.014)	-871.6 (± 15.3)	0.542 (± 0.022)	-981.5 (± 39.5)
	$\rho_n = 0.01$	0.588 (± 0.014)	-874.7 (± 15.3)	0.552 (± 0.021)	-952.2 (± 33.2)
	$\rho_n = 0.1$	0.585 (± 0.013)	-923.7 (± 15.2)	0.565 (± 0.019)	-942.0 (± 16.8)
	$\rho_n = 0.15$	0.578 (± 0.018)	-966.7 (± 13.5)	0.558 (± 0.018)	-975.8 (± 15.0)
	$\rho_n = 0.2$	0.503 (± 0.037)	-1001.6 (± 10.6)	0.519 (± 0.029)	-1007.8 (± 14.0)
Robust-label	$\Gamma = 1$	0.589 (± 0.013)	-873.9 (± 15.1)	0.544 (± 0.022)	-972.6 (± 36.7)
	$\Gamma = 10$	0.583 (± 0.014)	-886.5 (± 15.5)	0.555 (± 0.022)	-937.5 (± 26.2)
	$\Gamma = 100$	0.579 (± 0.013)	-941.5 (± 13.1)	0.558 (± 0.020)	-956.1 (± 13.3)
	$\Gamma = 200$	0.582 (± 0.015)	-979.7 (± 11.0)	0.557 (± 0.022)	-987.3 (± 9.9)
	$\Gamma = 300$	0.586 (± 0.015)	-1007.2 (± 9.5)	0.556 (± 0.021)	-1012.9 (± 8.7)

- All results are the average values of 30 replications. Values in the parentheses are standard deviations

- Best models are highlighted with gray cells

The results are similar to what we observe in the binary cases. In general, with reasonable settings of

the robust budget parameter ρ_n and Γ , we observe better testing accuracy and LL. The best robust feature model ($\rho_n = 0.1$) has a testing accuracy of 0.565 and the best robust label model ($\Gamma = 100$) has a testing accuracy of 0.558. While the conventional MNL model’s testing accuracy is 0.540. It is worth noting that, compared to the binary case study, the best hyper-parameter for robust label models can be quite different. This implies that hyper-parameter tuning may be necessary for implementing the robust MNL model.

The estimated β values of alternative specific features (i.e., cost and travel time) are shown in Table 5. Similar to binary cases, we observe the shrinkage of parameter scales with the increasing robust budget parameters. This is consistent with our analysis in Remark 4. Note that for the robust-label optimization, when Γ goes to $+\infty$, β will not be 0 (see Remark 4). The final values will depend on the data set.

Table 5: Selected estimated β for robust MNL models

Model	Parameters	Train time	Train cost	Car time	Car cost	SM time	SM cost
MNL	-	-1.34 (± 0.15)	-0.13 (± 0.04)	-1.27 (± 0.33)	-0.10 (± 0.03)	-1.08 (± 0.25)	-0.50 (± 0.28)
Robust-feature	$\rho_n = 0.001$	-1.34 (± 0.15)	-0.12 (± 0.03)	-1.26 (± 0.33)	-0.09 (± 0.03)	-1.07 (± 0.25)	-0.49 (± 0.28)
	$\rho_n = 0.01$	-1.26 (± 0.14)	-0.06 (± 0.02)	-1.19 (± 0.30)	-0.04 (± 0.01)	-1.00 (± 0.23)	-0.42 (± 0.25)
	$\rho_n = 0.1$	-0.69 (± 0.08)	0.04 (± 0.01)	-0.44 (± 0.12)	0.01 (± 0.01)	-0.33 (± 0.09)	-0.09 (± 0.07)
	$\rho_n = 0.15$	-0.45 (± 0.06)	0.06 (± 0.01)	-0.16 (± 0.06)	0.02 (± 0.00)	-0.11 (± 0.04)	-0.01 (± 0.02)
	$\rho_n = 0.2$	-0.29 (± 0.04)	0.07 (± 0.01)	-0.03 (± 0.02)	0.02 (± 0.00)	-0.02 (± 0.01)	0.00 (± 0.00)
Robust-label	$\Gamma = 1$	-1.20 (± 0.17)	-0.13 (± 0.04)	-1.07 (± 0.34)	-0.10 (± 0.03)	-0.74 (± 0.21)	-0.74 (± 0.26)
	$\Gamma = 10$	-0.89 (± 0.19)	-0.06 (± 0.02)	-0.80 (± 0.33)	-0.05 (± 0.02)	-0.44 (± 0.23)	-0.67 (± 0.24)
	$\Gamma = 100$	-0.36 (± 0.08)	-0.03 (± 0.01)	-0.37 (± 0.15)	-0.02 (± 0.01)	-0.21 (± 0.10)	-0.29 (± 0.11)
	$\Gamma = 200$	-0.22 (± 0.06)	-0.03 (± 0.01)	-0.24 (± 0.10)	-0.02 (± 0.01)	-0.13 (± 0.06)	-0.17 (± 0.06)
	$\Gamma = 300$	-0.16 (± 0.06)	-0.03 (± 0.01)	-0.18 (± 0.08)	-0.01 (± 0.01)	-0.10 (± 0.04)	-0.10 (± 0.04)

- All results are the average values of 30 replications. Values in the parentheses are standard deviations

6. Conclusion

In this paper, we propose a robust discrete choice model framework that accommodates testing data uncertainties. The goal is to enhance the model’s prediction accuracy in new samples. Our model is rooted in the theory of robust optimization. Specifically, we address feature uncertainties by assuming the ℓ_p -norm of measurement errors are below a predetermined threshold. For label uncertainties, we assume there are at most Γ mislabeled choices as the uncertainty set. Under these assumptions, we derive tractable robust counterparts for both robust-feature and robust-label DCMs. The proposed models are validated in both binary and multinomial choice data sets. The results demonstrate that the robust models outperform the conventional BNL and MNL models in terms of prediction accuracy and log likelihood when there are measurement errors in testing data. Our findings suggest that the robustness component functions as “regularization”, leading to improved generalizability of the models.

There are several future extensions for the current model. First, it is possible to combine the robust-label and the robust-feature models by assuming an uncertainty set with both feature and label measurement errors. Future research may work on deriving the closed-form formulations for the integrated model. Second, The performance of robust models may depend on the hyper-parameters. Future studies may develop methods to automatically tune the hyper-parameters. Third, the robust-feature MNL model derived in this study is an approximation. Future studies may consider quantifying the bound of the approximation or propose better approximation methods.

Authors Contributions

Baichuan Mo: Conceptualization, Methodology, Software, Formal analysis, Data Curation, Writing - Original Draft, Writing - Review & Editing, Visualization. **Yunhan Zheng:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Software, Data Curation, Writing - Original Draft. **Xiaotong Guo:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing - Review & Editing. **Ruoyun Ma:** Software, Data Curation. **Jinhua Zhao:** Conceptualization, Supervision, Project administration, Funding acquisition.

Appendices

Appendix A. Solving robust MNL via approximation of the objective function by Jensen's inequality

Another way to address the robust MNL is referring to the idea from [Bertsimas et al. \(2022\)](#) which considers a robust geometric optimization. The idea is to 1) first reformulate the robust convex constraint into a robust linear optimization problem with bilinear equalities in the uncertainty set, 2) then apply the reformulation-perspectification technique to get a safe approximation of the robust convex inequality that is linear in the uncertain parameters. 3) Finally, we convert the approximated problem obtained in Step 2 to a tractable robust counterpart using convex conjugates ([Ben-Tal et al., 2015](#)).

Definition 1 (Convex conjugate). *For a proper, closed, and convex function f , we define its conjugate as*

$$f^*(\mathbf{w}) = \max_{\mathbf{y} \in \text{dom } f} \{\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{y} - f(\mathbf{y})\} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where $\text{dom } f$ is the domain of function f . When f is closed and convex, $f^{**}(\cdot) = f(\cdot)$, that is:

$$f(\mathbf{y}) = \max_{\mathbf{w} \in \text{dom } f^*} \{\mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{w} - f^*(\mathbf{w})\} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Specially, consider a function $g(\mathbf{y}) = \log(\sum_i \exp(y_i))$, we have

$$g^*(\mathbf{w}) = \sum_i w_i \log w_i, \quad \text{dom } g^* = \{\mathbf{w} \geq 0 : \sum_i w_i = 1\} \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Therefore:

$$g(\mathbf{y}) = \max_{\mathbf{w} \in \{\mathbf{w} \geq 0, \sum_i w_i = 1\}} \{\mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{w} - \sum_i w_i \log w_i\} \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Substituting $\mathbf{y} = \left((e_j - e_{I_n})^T \mathbf{a}_n \right)_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n}$, we have

$$g\left(\left((e_j - e_{I_n})^T \mathbf{a}_n \right)_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n}\right) = \log \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} \exp \left((e_j - e_{I_n})^T \mathbf{a}_n \right) \right) \quad (\text{A.5})$$

and

$$\log \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} \exp((\mathbf{e}_j - \mathbf{e}_{I_n})^T \mathbf{a}_n) \right) = \max_{\mathbf{w}_n \in \mathcal{W}_n} \left\{ \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} w_{n,j} \cdot ((\mathbf{e}_j - \mathbf{e}_{I_n})^T \mathbf{a}_n) - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} w_{n,j} \log w_{n,j} \right\} \quad (\text{A.6})$$

where $\mathbf{w}_n = (w_{n,j})_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n}$ is the dual variable and $\mathcal{W}_n = \{\mathbf{w}_n : \mathbf{w}_n \geq 0, \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} w_{n,j} = 1\}$. Notice that:

$$(\mathbf{e}_j - \mathbf{e}_{I_n})^T \mathbf{a}_n = (\boldsymbol{\beta}_j - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{I_n})^T (\mathbf{x}_n + \boldsymbol{\Delta} \mathbf{x}_n) \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Hence, Eq. A.6 is equivalent to

$$\max_{\mathbf{w}_n \in \mathcal{W}_n} \left\{ \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} w_{n,j} \cdot (\boldsymbol{\beta}_j - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{I_n})^T \mathbf{x}_n + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} w_{n,j} \cdot (\boldsymbol{\beta}_j - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{I_n})^T \boldsymbol{\Delta} \mathbf{x}_n - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} w_{n,j} \log w_{n,j} \right\} \quad (\text{A.8})$$

Therefore, the robust constraint for individual n (Eq. 27) is equivalent to

$$\max_{\substack{\boldsymbol{\Delta} \mathbf{x}_n \in \mathcal{Z}_n \\ \mathbf{w}_n \in \mathcal{W}_n}} \left\{ \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} w_{n,j} \cdot (\boldsymbol{\beta}_j - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{I_n})^T \mathbf{x}_n + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} w_{n,j} \cdot (\boldsymbol{\beta}_j - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{I_n})^T \boldsymbol{\Delta} \mathbf{x}_n - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} w_{n,j} \log w_{n,j} \right\} \leq -t \quad (\text{A.9})$$

In order to make the inner objective function linear, let us define

$$\tilde{\mathcal{W}}_n = \{(\mathbf{w}_n, Y_n) : \mathbf{w}_n \in \mathcal{W}_n, \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} w_{n,j} \log w_{n,j} \leq Y_n\} \quad (\text{A.10})$$

where $\tilde{\mathcal{W}}_n$ is the epigraph of $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} w_{n,j} \log w_{n,j}$. Then Eq. A.9 is equivalent to

$$\max_{\substack{\boldsymbol{\Delta} \mathbf{x}_n \in \mathcal{Z}_n \\ (\mathbf{w}_n, Y_n) \in \tilde{\mathcal{W}}_n}} \left\{ \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} w_{n,j} \cdot (\boldsymbol{\beta}_j - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{I_n})^T \mathbf{x}_n + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} w_{n,j} \cdot (\boldsymbol{\beta}_j - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{I_n})^T \boldsymbol{\Delta} \mathbf{x}_n - Y_n \right\} \leq -t \quad (\text{A.11})$$

Let us replace the bi-linear term $w_{n,j} \boldsymbol{\Delta} \mathbf{x}_n$ with a new variable $\mathbf{v}_{n,j} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{K}|}$. Eq. A.11 can be reformulated as:

$$\max_{\substack{\boldsymbol{\Delta} \mathbf{x}_n \in \mathcal{Z}_n \\ (\mathbf{w}_n, Y_n) \in \tilde{\mathcal{W}}_n \\ \mathbf{v}_{n,j} = w_{n,j} \boldsymbol{\Delta} \mathbf{x}_{n,j}}} \left\{ \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} \left(w_{n,j} \cdot (\boldsymbol{\beta}_j - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{I_n})^T \mathbf{x}_n + (\boldsymbol{\beta}_j - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{I_n})^T \mathbf{v}_{n,j} \right) - Y_n \right\} \leq -t \quad (\text{A.12})$$

Now the objective function in Eq. A.12 is linear. However, the domain of the decision variables becomes complicated. Let the domain of all decision variables be:

$$\Theta_n = \{(\mathbf{w}_n, Y_n, \boldsymbol{\Delta} \mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{v}_n) : \boldsymbol{\Delta} \mathbf{x}_n \in \mathcal{Z}_n, (\mathbf{w}_n, Y_n) \in \tilde{\mathcal{W}}_n, \mathbf{v}_{n,j} = w_{n,j} \boldsymbol{\Delta} \mathbf{x}_{n,j}, \forall j \in \mathcal{C}_n\} \quad (\text{A.13})$$

Θ_n is non-convex (e.g., it has many bi-linear terms). Now Eq. A.12 is a maximization of a linear function over a non-convex set. We will use the outer approximation for the non-convex set to get a safe approximation

of the robust optimization problem.

The key idea for the outer approximation is to derive new convex constraints from the non-convex set Θ_n . The derived new constraints will formulate a convex set $\tilde{\Theta}_n$, which is an outer approximation of Θ_n ($\Theta_n \subseteq \tilde{\Theta}_n$).

Proposition 1. *For the robust MNL problem with feature uncertainties above, a convex outer approximation for Θ_n (Eq. A.13) is:*

$$\tilde{\Theta}_n = \left\{ (\mathbf{w}_n, Y_n, \mathbf{v}_n, \Delta \mathbf{x}_n) : \right. \quad (\text{A.14a})$$

$$\|\Delta \mathbf{x}_n\|_p \leq \rho_n, \quad \forall n \in \mathcal{N} \quad (\text{A.14b})$$

$$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} \mathbf{v}_{n,j} = \Delta \mathbf{x}_n, \quad \forall n \in \mathcal{N} \quad (\text{A.14c})$$

$$\mathbf{w}_n \geq 0, \quad \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} w_{n,j} = 1, \quad \forall n \in \mathcal{N} \quad (\text{A.14d})$$

$$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} w_{n,j} \log w_{n,j} \leq Y_n, \quad \forall n \in \mathcal{N} \quad (\text{A.14e})$$

$$\|\mathbf{v}_{n,i}\|_p \leq \rho_n \cdot w_{n,i} \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{C}_n, \forall n \in \mathcal{N} \left. \right\} \quad (\text{A.14f})$$

where $\mathbf{w}_n = (w_{n,i})_{i \in \mathcal{C}_n}$, Y_n , $\mathbf{v}_n = (\mathbf{v}_{n,i})_{i \in \mathcal{C}_n}$, $\mathbf{v}_{n,i} = (v_{n,i}^{(k)})_{k \in \mathcal{K}}$ are auxiliary decision variables. For a special case with $p = \infty$, we can further tight the outer approximation with:

$$\tilde{\tilde{\Theta}}_n(p = \infty) = \left\{ (\mathbf{w}_n, Y_n, \mathbf{v}_n, \Delta \mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{r}_n) \in \tilde{\Theta}_n : \right. \quad (\text{A.15a})$$

$$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} (w_{n,j} \cdot \rho_n + v_{n,j}^{(k)}) \cdot \log \frac{w_{n,j} \cdot \rho_n + v_{n,j}^{(k)}}{\rho_n + \Delta x_n^{(k)}} \leq Y_n \cdot \rho_n + r_n^{(k)} \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{K} \quad (\text{A.15b})$$

$$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} (w_{n,j} \cdot \rho_n - v_{n,j}^{(k)}) \cdot \log \frac{w_{n,j} \cdot \rho_n - v_{n,j}^{(k)}}{\rho_n - \Delta x_n^{(k)}} \leq Y_n \cdot \rho_n - r_n^{(k)} \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{K} \left. \right\} \quad (\text{A.15c})$$

where $\mathbf{r}_n = (r_n^{(k)})_{k \in \mathcal{K}}$ are auxiliary decision variables.

The proof of the proposition can be found in [Appendix B](#).

According to Proposition 1, a safe approximation of the robust MNL (Eq. 25) can be reformulated as:

$$\max_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}, t} t \quad (\text{A.16a})$$

$$\text{s.t.} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \max_{(\mathbf{w}_n, Y_n, \mathbf{v}_n) \in \tilde{\Theta}_n} \left\{ \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} \left(w_{n,j} \cdot (\beta_j - \beta_{I_n})^T \mathbf{x}_n + (\beta_j - \beta_{I_n})^T \mathbf{v}_{n,j} \right) - Y_n \right\} \leq -t \quad (\text{A.16b})$$

Now the problem becomes a robust linear optimization over a convex uncertainty set.

Remark 5. The solution of Eq. A.16 is a lower bound of the original robust MNL problem (Eq. 8). The reason is that, $\tilde{\Theta}_n$ is an outer approximation of Θ_n ($\Theta_n \subseteq \tilde{\Theta}_n$). Therefore, the uncertainty set in Eq. A.16b is larger than the original uncertainty set. Then the worst case in Eq. A.16 is worse than that in the original

robust MNL problem. Thus, the optimal objective function in Eq. A.16 is smaller than that in Eq. 8 (i.e., lower bound for a maximization problem).

To derive the closed-form formulation for Eq. A.16, we adopted the the general framework proposed in Ben-Tal et al. (2015) to derive a tractable robust counterpart based on support functions.

Definition 2 (Set indicator function and support function). *Let $\delta(\mathbf{y} \mid \mathcal{Q})$ be the indicator function on set \mathcal{Z} such that:*

$$\delta(\mathbf{y} \mid \mathcal{Q}) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Q} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.17})$$

Then the convex conjugate of $\delta(\mathbf{y} \mid \mathcal{Q})$ is (Bertsimas and den Hertog, 2020):

$$\delta^*(\mathbf{w} \mid \mathcal{Q}) = \sup_{\mathbf{y}} \{\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{y} - \delta(\mathbf{y} \mid \mathcal{Q})\} = \sup_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Q}} \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{y} \quad (\text{A.18})$$

Therefore, the inner maximization in Eq. A.16b can be transformed to:

$$\sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \max_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_n \in \tilde{\Theta}_n} (\mathbf{c}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}))^T \boldsymbol{\theta}_n = \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \delta^*(\mathbf{c}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \mid \tilde{\Theta}_n) \leq -t \quad (\text{A.19})$$

where $\boldsymbol{\theta}_n = (\mathbf{w}_n, \mathbf{v}_n, Y_n)$, $\mathbf{c}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \in \mathbb{R}^{|\boldsymbol{\theta}_n|}$ is a vector such that

$$(\mathbf{c}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}))^T \boldsymbol{\theta}_n = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} \left(w_{n,j} \cdot (\beta_j - \beta_{I_n})^T \mathbf{x}_n + (\beta_j - \beta_{I_n})^T \mathbf{v}_{n,j} \right) - Y_n \quad (\text{A.20})$$

Proposition 2 describes how to eliminate the maximization operator based on the support function.

Proposition 2. *Under the setting of the robust MNL problem in this study, the constraint $\sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \delta^*(\mathbf{c}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \mid \tilde{\Theta}_n) \leq -t$ is equivalent to:*

$$\min_{\mathbf{d}_n, \mathbf{z}_n} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \left(\rho_n \cdot \left\| \mathbf{z}_n^{(1)} \right\|_q + \mathbf{b}_n^T \mathbf{z}_n^{(2)} + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} \cdot \exp(z_{n,j}^{(3, \mathbf{w}_n)} - 1) \right) \leq -t \quad (\text{A.21a})$$

$$\mathbf{A}_n^T \cdot \mathbf{z}_n^{(1)} = \mathbf{d}_n^{(1)}, \quad \forall n \in \mathcal{N} \quad (\text{A.21b})$$

$$\mathbf{B}_n^T \cdot \mathbf{z}_n^{(2)} = \mathbf{d}_n^{(2)}, \quad \mathbf{z}_n^{(2)} \geq 0, \quad \forall n \in \mathcal{N} \quad (\text{A.21c})$$

$$z_n^{(3, Y_n)} = -1, \quad \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{w}_n}^T \cdot \mathbf{z}_n^{(3, \mathbf{w}_n)} + \mathbf{S}_{Y_n}^T \cdot z_n^{(3, Y_n)} = \mathbf{d}_n^{(3)} \quad \forall n \in \mathcal{N} \quad (\text{A.21d})$$

$$\left\| \mathbf{z}_n^{(4, \mathbf{v}_{n,i})} \right\|_q \leq 1, \quad z_n^{(4, w_{n,i})} = -\rho_n, \quad \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{v}_{n,i}}^T \cdot \mathbf{z}_n^{(4, \mathbf{v}_{n,i})} + \mathbf{S}_{w_{n,i}}^T \cdot z_n^{(4, w_{n,i})} = \mathbf{d}_n^{(4,i)}, \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{C}_n, \forall n \in \mathcal{N} \quad (\text{A.21e})$$

$$\mathbf{d}_n^{(1)} + \mathbf{d}_n^{(2)} + \mathbf{d}_n^{(3)} + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}_n} \mathbf{d}_n^{(4,i)} = \mathbf{c}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}), \quad \forall n \in \mathcal{N} \quad (\text{A.21f})$$

where $\mathbf{d}_n^{(1)}, \mathbf{d}_n^{(2)}, \mathbf{d}_n^{(3)}, \mathbf{d}_n^{(4,i)}$ ($\forall i \in \mathcal{C}_n$) $\in \mathbb{R}^{|\boldsymbol{\theta}_n|}$, $\mathbf{z}_n^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathbf{v}_{n,1}|}$, $\mathbf{z}_n^{(2)} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{C}_n|}$, $\mathbf{z}_n^{(3)} = ((z_{n,j}^{(3, \mathbf{w}_n)})_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n}, z_n^{(3, Y_n)}) \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathbf{w}_n, Y_n|}$, $\mathbf{z}_n^{(4,i)} = ((z_{n,k}^{(4, \mathbf{v}_{n,i})})_{k \in \mathcal{K}}, z_n^{(4, w_{n,i})}) \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathbf{v}_{n,i}, w_{n,i}|}$ ($\forall i \in \mathcal{C}_n$) are all auxiliary decision variables. $\mathbf{d}_n = (\mathbf{d}_n^{(1)}, \mathbf{d}_n^{(2)}, \mathbf{d}_n^{(3)}, (\mathbf{d}_n^{(4,i)})_{i \in \mathcal{C}_n})$, $\mathbf{z}_n = (\mathbf{z}_n^{(1)}, \mathbf{z}_n^{(2)}, \mathbf{z}_n^{(3)}, (\mathbf{z}_n^{(4,i)})_{i \in \mathcal{C}_n})$. $\|\cdot\|_q$ is the dual norm

of $\|\cdot\|_p$ (i.e., $\frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{p} = 1$). \mathbf{A}_n is defined such that $\mathbf{A}_n \cdot \boldsymbol{\theta}_n = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} \mathbf{v}_{n,j}$. \mathbf{B}_n and \mathbf{b}_n are defined such that $\mathbf{B}_n \cdot \boldsymbol{\theta}_n \leq \mathbf{b}_n \Leftrightarrow$ Constraint A.14d. \mathbf{S}_{w_n} , \mathbf{S}_{Y_n} , $\mathbf{S}_{v_{n,i}}$, and $\mathbf{S}_{w_{n,i}}$ are selection matrices such that $\mathbf{S}_{w_n} \cdot \boldsymbol{\theta}_n = \mathbf{w}_n$, $\mathbf{S}_{Y_n} \cdot \boldsymbol{\theta}_n = Y_n$, $\mathbf{S}_{v_{n,i}} \cdot \boldsymbol{\theta}_n = \mathbf{v}_{n,i}$, and $\mathbf{S}_{w_{n,i}} \cdot \boldsymbol{\theta}_n = w_{n,i}$.

The proof is mathematically tedious and is attached in [Appendix C](#). The specification of these parameters (e.g., \mathbf{A}_n , \mathbf{B}_n) can be found in [Appendix D](#). According to [Proposition 2](#), after eliminating t , the approximated robust MNL problem (Eq. [A.16](#)) can be reformulated as:

$$\min_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}, \mathbf{d}_n, z_n} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \left(\rho_n \cdot \left\| \mathbf{z}_n^{(1)} \right\|_q + \mathbf{b}_n^T \mathbf{z}_n^{(2)} + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} \exp(z_{n,j}^{(3)} - 1) \right) \quad (\text{A.22a})$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \text{Constraints } \text{A.21b} \sim \text{A.21f} \quad (\text{A.22b})$$

where This problem has twice continuously differentiable concave (or linear) constraints and linear objective function, making it tractably solvable with an interior point method

Appendix B. Proof of Proposition 1

The outer approximation for Θ_n can be derived through reformulation-perspectification techniques.

$$\tilde{\Theta}_n = \left\{ (\mathbf{w}_n, Y_n, \mathbf{v}_n) : \right. \quad (\text{B.1a})$$

$$\left\| \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} \mathbf{v}_{n,j} \right\|_p \leq \rho_n, \quad \forall n \in \mathcal{N} \quad (\text{B.1b})$$

$$\mathbf{w}_n \geq 0, \quad \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} w_{n,j} = 1, \quad \forall n \in \mathcal{N} \quad (\text{B.1c})$$

$$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} w_{n,j} \log w_{n,j} \leq Y_n, \quad \forall n \in \mathcal{N} \quad (\text{B.1d})$$

$$\left\| \mathbf{v}_{n,i} \right\|_p \leq \rho_n \cdot w_{n,i} \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{C}_n, \forall n \in \mathcal{N} \left. \right\} \quad (\text{B.1e})$$

Combining the constraints that $\mathbf{w}_n \geq 0$ and $\|\Delta \mathbf{x}_n\|_p \leq \rho_n$, we have

$$w_{n,i} \cdot \|\Delta \mathbf{x}_n\|_p \leq \rho_n \cdot w_{n,i} \quad \forall j \in \mathcal{C}_n \quad (\text{B.2})$$

Since $w_{n,i} \cdot \|\Delta \mathbf{x}_n\|_p = \|\mathbf{v}_{n,i}\|_p$, we have a new convex constraint:

$$\|\mathbf{v}_{n,i}\|_p \leq \rho_n \cdot w_{n,i} \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{C}_n \quad (\text{B.3})$$

Similarly, multiplying both sides of the constraint $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} w_{n,j} = 1$ by $\Delta \mathbf{x}_n$, we have

$$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} w_{n,j} \cdot \Delta \mathbf{x}_n = \Delta \mathbf{x}_n \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{C}_n \quad (\text{B.4})$$

As $\mathbf{v}_{n,j} = w_{n,j} \cdot \Delta \mathbf{x}_n$ by definition, the new linear constraint is

$$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} \mathbf{v}_{n,j} = \Delta \mathbf{x}_n \quad (\text{B.5})$$

After eliminating all equality constraints, an outer approximation for Θ_n can be derived as Eq. B.1. Note that constraints B.1b and B.1c are from the sets \mathcal{Z}_n and $\tilde{\mathcal{W}}_n$.

Now consider the special case with $p = \infty$. We have a box uncertainty: $\|\Delta \mathbf{x}_n\|_\infty \leq \rho_n$. Notice that the box uncertainty can be written in linear form:

$$\|\Delta \mathbf{x}_n\|_\infty \leq \rho_n, \forall j \in \mathcal{C}_n \iff -\rho_n \leq \Delta x_n^{(k)} \leq \rho_n, \forall k \in \mathcal{K} \quad (\text{B.6})$$

Combining constraint $\Delta x_n^{(k)} \leq \rho_n$ (i.e., $\rho_n - \Delta x_n^{(k)} \geq 0$) and $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} w_{n,j} \log w_{n,j} \leq Y_n$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\rho_n - \Delta x_n^{(k)}) \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} w_{n,j} \log \frac{w_{n,j}(\rho_n - \Delta x_n^{(k)})}{\rho_n - \Delta x_n^{(k)}} &\leq Y_n \cdot (\rho_n - \Delta x_n^{(k)}) \\ \iff \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} (w_{n,j} \cdot \rho_n - v_{n,j}^{(k)}) \cdot \log \frac{w_{n,j} \rho_n - v_{n,j}^{(k)}}{\rho_n - \Delta x_n^{(k)}} &\leq Y_n \cdot \rho_n - r_n^{(k)} \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{K} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.7})$$

where $\mathbf{r}_n = Y_n \cdot \Delta \mathbf{x}_n$ is a newly-introduced decision variable. Similarly, combining constraint $\Delta x_n^{(k)} \geq -\rho_n$ and $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} w_{n,j} \log w_{n,j} \leq Y_n$ we have

$$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} (w_{n,j} \rho_n + v_{n,j}^{(k)}) \cdot \log \frac{w_{n,j} \rho_n + v_{n,j}^{(k)}}{\rho_n + \Delta x_n^{(k)}} \leq Y_n \cdot \rho_n + r_n^{(k)} \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{K} \quad (\text{B.8})$$

Therefore, a tighter outer approximation for Θ_n can be expressed in Eq. A.15.

Appendix C. Proof of Proposition 2

To derive the robust counterpart of the constraint, we first introduce the following lemma.

Lemma 3. Let $\mathcal{Q}_1, \dots, \mathcal{Q}_k$ be closed convex sets, such that $\bigcap_i \text{ri}(\mathcal{Q}_i) \neq \emptyset^1$, and let $\mathcal{Q} = \bigcap_{i=1}^k \mathcal{Q}_i$. Then,

$$\delta^*(\mathbf{y} \mid \mathcal{Q}) = \min_{\mathbf{r}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_k} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^k \delta^*(\mathbf{r}_i \mid \mathcal{Q}_i) \mid \sum_{i=1}^k \mathbf{r}_i = \mathbf{y} \right\},$$

where $\delta^*(\cdot \mid \cdot)$ is the support function (i.e., convex conjugate of the indicator function).

¹ $\text{ri}(\mathcal{Q}_i)$ indicates the relative interior of the set \mathcal{Z}_i .

Therefore, we can define some convex sets $\tilde{\Theta}_n^{(i)}$ with $\tilde{\Theta}_n = \bigcap_i \tilde{\Theta}_n^{(i)}$, such that:

$$\sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \delta^*(\mathbf{c}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \mid \tilde{\Theta}_n) \leq -t \Leftrightarrow \begin{cases} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \min_{\mathbf{d}_n^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{d}_n^{(k)}} \sum_{i=1}^k \delta^*(\mathbf{d}_n^{(i)} \mid \tilde{\Theta}_n^{(i)}) \leq -t \\ \sum_{i=1}^k \mathbf{d}_n^{(i)} = \mathbf{c}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \quad \forall n \in \mathcal{N} \end{cases} \quad (\text{C.1})$$

Now we will focus on the derivation of each $\delta^*(\cdot \mid \tilde{\Theta}_n^{(i)})$.

Define a matrix $\mathbf{A}_n \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{V}_{n,1}| \times |\boldsymbol{\theta}_n|}$ such that $\mathbf{A}_n \cdot \boldsymbol{\theta}_n = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} \mathbf{v}_{n,j}$. Therefore, Eq. B.1b can be written as a matrix form:

$$\tilde{\Theta}_n^{(1)} = \{\boldsymbol{\theta}_n : \|\mathbf{A}_n \cdot \boldsymbol{\theta}_n\|_p \leq \rho_n\} \quad (\text{C.2})$$

The following lemma describes how to deal with the conjugate with a linear map:

Lemma 4. *Let \mathbf{D} be a linear transformation from \mathbb{R}^n to \mathbb{R}^m . Assume there exists an \mathbf{x} such that $\mathbf{D} \cdot \mathbf{x} \in \text{ri}(\text{dom } g)$. Then, for each convex function g on \mathbb{R}^m , we have:*

$$(g\mathbf{D})^*(\mathbf{z}) = \min_{\mathbf{y}} \{g^*(\mathbf{y}) \mid \mathbf{D}^T \cdot \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{z}\} \quad (\text{C.3})$$

where the function $(g\mathbf{D})$ is defined by $(g\mathbf{D})(\mathbf{x}) = g(\mathbf{D} \cdot \mathbf{x})$.

From Lemmas 1 (i.e., dual norm) and Lemma 4, we have

$$\delta^*(\mathbf{d}_n^{(1)} \mid \tilde{\Theta}_n^{(1)}) = \min_{\mathbf{z}_n^{(1)}} \left\{ \rho_n \cdot \|\mathbf{z}_n^{(1)}\|_q \mid \mathbf{A}_n^T \cdot \mathbf{z}_n^{(1)} = \mathbf{d}_n^{(1)} \right\} \quad (\text{C.4})$$

where $\mathbf{d}_n^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\boldsymbol{\theta}_n|}$ and $\mathbf{z}_n^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{V}_{n,1}|}$ are auxiliary decision variables.

Notice that Constraint B.1c is a set of linear constraints. It can be rewriting in a general matrix form: $\mathbf{B}_n \cdot \boldsymbol{\theta}_n \leq \mathbf{b}_n$, where $\mathbf{B}_n \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{C}_n| \times |\boldsymbol{\theta}_n|}$ and $\mathbf{b}_n \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{C}_n|}$. Define:

$$\tilde{\Theta}_n^{(2)} = \{\boldsymbol{\theta}_n : \mathbf{B}_n \cdot \boldsymbol{\theta}_n \leq \mathbf{b}_n\} \quad (\text{C.5})$$

According to the linear duality, we have:

$$\delta^*(\mathbf{d}_n^{(2)} \mid \tilde{\Theta}_n^{(2)}) = \min_{\mathbf{z}_n^{(2)}} \{\mathbf{b}_n^T \cdot \mathbf{z}_n^{(2)} \mid \mathbf{B}_n^T \cdot \mathbf{z}_n^{(2)} = \mathbf{d}_n^{(2)}, \mathbf{z}_n^{(2)} \geq 0\} \quad (\text{C.6})$$

where $\mathbf{z}_n^{(2)} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{C}_n|}$ is an auxiliary decision variable.

Consider Constraint B.1d, let $h_{\mathbf{w}_n}(\mathbf{w}_n) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} w_{n,j} \log w_{n,j}$, and $h_{Y_n}(Y_n) = -Y_n$. Then Constraint B.1d becomes:

$$h_{\mathbf{w}_n}(\mathbf{w}_n) + h_{Y_n}(Y_n) \leq 0 \quad (\text{C.7})$$

Define:

$$\tilde{\Theta}_n^{(3)} = \{\boldsymbol{\theta}_n : h_{\mathbf{w}_n}(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{w}_n} \cdot \boldsymbol{\theta}_n) + h_{Y_n}(\mathbf{S}_{Y_n} \cdot \boldsymbol{\theta}_n) \leq 0\} \quad (\text{C.8})$$

where $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{w}_n} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathbf{w}_n| \times |\boldsymbol{\theta}_n|}$ and $\mathbf{S}_{Y_n} \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times |\boldsymbol{\theta}_n|}$ are selection matrices such that $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{w}_n} \cdot \boldsymbol{\theta}_n = \mathbf{w}_n$ and $\mathbf{S}_{Y_n} \cdot \boldsymbol{\theta}_n = Y_n$. To derive the support function, we first introduce the following lemma:

Lemma 5. Let $\mathcal{Q} = \{\mathbf{y} \mid \sum_{k=1}^K h_k(\mathbf{y}) \leq 0\}$, where $h_k(\mathbf{y})$ is convex and $\cap_{k=1}^K \text{ri}(\text{dom } h_k) \neq \emptyset$. Then:

$$\delta^*(\mathbf{w} \mid \mathcal{Q}) = \min_{\mathbf{v}_k} \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^K h_k^*(\mathbf{v}_k) \mid \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{v}_k = \mathbf{w}, \forall k = 1, \dots, K \right\} \quad (\text{C.9})$$

The proof of the lemma can be found in [Ben-Tal et al. \(2015\)](#). Notice that the convex conjugates of $h_{\mathbf{w}_n}(\cdot)$ and $h_{Y_n}(\cdot)$ are:

$$h_{\mathbf{w}_n}^*(\mathbf{z}) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} \exp(z_j - 1), \text{ dom } h_{\mathbf{w}_n}^* = \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{C}_n|} \quad (\text{C.10})$$

$$h_{Y_n}^*(z) = 0, \text{ dom } h_{Y_n}^* = \{-1\} \quad (\text{C.11})$$

Then, according to Lemma 5 and Eqs. C.10 and C.11, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \delta^*(\mathbf{d}_n^{(3)} \mid \tilde{\Theta}_n^{(3)}) \\ &= \min_{\mathbf{z}_n^{(3)}} \left\{ \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} \exp(z_{n,j}^{(3, \mathbf{w}_n)} - 1) \mid z_n^{(3, Y_n)} = -1, \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{w}_n}^T \cdot \mathbf{z}_n^{(3, \mathbf{w}_n)} + \mathbf{S}_{Y_n}^T \cdot \mathbf{z}_n^{(3, Y_n)} = \mathbf{d}_n^{(3)} \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.12})$$

where $\mathbf{z}_n^{(3)} = ((z_{n,j}^{(3, \mathbf{w}_n)})_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n}, z_n^{(3, Y_n)}) \in \mathbb{R}^{(|\mathcal{C}_n|, Y_n)}$ are auxiliary decision variables.

Now consider constraint B.1e. Let $h_{\mathbf{v}_{n,i}}(\mathbf{v}_{n,i}) = \|\mathbf{v}_{n,i}\|_p$, $h_{w_{n,i}}(w_{n,i}) = -\rho_n \cdot w_{n,i}$. Define:

$$\tilde{\Theta}_n^{(4,i)} = \{\boldsymbol{\theta}_n : \|\mathbf{v}_{n,i}\|_p - \rho_n \cdot w_{n,i} \leq 0\} \quad (\text{C.13})$$

The convex conjugates of $h_{\mathbf{v}_{n,i}}(\cdot)$ and $h_{w_{n,i}}(\cdot)$ are:

$$h_{\mathbf{v}_{n,i}}^*(\mathbf{z}) = 0, \text{ dom } h_{\mathbf{v}_{n,i}}^* = \{\mathbf{z} : \|\mathbf{z}\| \leq 1\} \quad (\text{C.14})$$

$$h_{w_{n,i}}^*(z) = 0, \text{ dom } h_{w_{n,i}}^* = \{-\rho_n\} \quad (\text{C.15})$$

Define the selection matrices $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{v}_{n,i}} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathbf{v}_{n,i}| \times |\boldsymbol{\theta}_n|}$ and $\mathbf{S}_{w_{n,i}} \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times |\boldsymbol{\theta}_n|}$ such that $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{v}_{n,i}} \cdot \boldsymbol{\theta}_n = \mathbf{v}_{n,i}$ and $\mathbf{S}_{w_{n,i}} \cdot \boldsymbol{\theta}_n = w_{n,i}$. Then, according to Lemma 5, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \delta^*(\mathbf{d}_n^{(4,i)} \mid \tilde{\Theta}_n^{(4,i)}) \\ &= \min_{\mathbf{z}_n^{(4,i)}} \left\{ 0 \mid \|\mathbf{z}_n^{(4, \mathbf{v}_{n,i})}\|_q \leq 1, z_n^{(4, w_{n,i})} = -\rho_n, \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{v}_{n,i}}^T \cdot \mathbf{z}_n^{(4, \mathbf{v}_{n,i})} + \mathbf{S}_{w_{n,i}}^T \cdot z_n^{(4, w_{n,i})} = \mathbf{d}_n^{(4,i)} \right\} \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{C}_n \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.16})$$

where $\mathbf{z}_n^{(4,i)} = ((z_{n,k}^{(4, \mathbf{v}_{n,i})})_{k \in \mathcal{K}}, z_n^{(4, w_{n,i})}) \in \mathbb{R}^{(|\mathcal{K}|, w_{n,i})}$ is an auxiliary decision variable.

With $\delta^*(\mathbf{d}_n^{(j)} | \tilde{\Theta}_n^{(j)})$ ($j = 1, \dots, 4$). The inequality in Eq. C.1 can be reformulate as:

$$\sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \min_{\mathbf{d}_n} \delta^*(\mathbf{d}_n^{(1)} | \tilde{\Theta}_n^{(1)}) + \delta^*(\mathbf{d}_n^{(2)} | \tilde{\Theta}_n^{(2)}) + \delta^*(\mathbf{d}_n^{(3)} | \tilde{\Theta}_n^{(3)}) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}_n} \delta^*(\mathbf{d}_n^{(4,i)} | \tilde{\Theta}_n^{(4,i)}) \leq -t \quad (\text{C.17a})$$

$$\mathbf{d}_n^{(1)} + \mathbf{d}_n^{(2)} + \mathbf{d}_n^{(3)} + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}_n} \mathbf{d}_n^{(4,i)} = \mathbf{c}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}), \quad \forall n \in \mathcal{N} \quad (\text{C.17b})$$

where $\mathbf{d}_n = (\mathbf{d}_n^{(1)}, \mathbf{d}_n^{(2)}, \mathbf{d}_n^{(3)}, (\mathbf{d}_n^{(4,i)})_{i \in \mathcal{C}_n})$. Substituting each $\delta^*(\mathbf{d}_n^{(j)} | \tilde{\Theta}_n^{(j)})$ to Eq. C.17 results in:

$$\min_{\mathbf{d}_n, \mathbf{z}_n} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \left(\rho_n \cdot \left\| \mathbf{z}_n^{(1)} \right\|_q + \mathbf{b}_n^T \mathbf{z}_n^{(2)} + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} \cdot \exp(z_{n,j}^{(3, \mathbf{w}_n)} - 1) \right) \leq -t \quad (\text{C.18})$$

$$\mathbf{A}_n^T \cdot \mathbf{z}_n^{(1)} = \mathbf{d}_n^{(1)}, \quad \forall n \in \mathcal{N} \quad (\text{C.19})$$

$$\mathbf{B}_n^T \cdot \mathbf{z}_n^{(2)} = \mathbf{d}_n^{(2)}, \quad \mathbf{z}_n^{(2)} \geq 0, \quad \forall n \in \mathcal{N} \quad (\text{C.20})$$

$$z_n^{(3, Y_n)} = -1, \quad \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{w}_n}^T \cdot \mathbf{z}_n^{(3, \mathbf{w}_n)} + \mathbf{S}_{Y_n}^T \cdot z_n^{(3, Y_n)} = \mathbf{d}_n^{(3)} \quad \forall n \in \mathcal{N} \quad (\text{C.21})$$

$$\left\| \mathbf{z}_n^{(4, \mathbf{v}_{n,i})} \right\|_q \leq 1, \quad z_n^{(4, \mathbf{w}_{n,i})} = -\rho_n, \quad \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{v}_{n,i}}^T \cdot \mathbf{z}_n^{(4, \mathbf{v}_{n,i})} + \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{w}_{n,i}}^T \cdot z_n^{(4, \mathbf{w}_{n,i})} = \mathbf{d}_n^{(4,i)}, \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{C}_n, \forall n \in \mathcal{N} \quad (\text{C.22})$$

$$\mathbf{d}_n^{(1)} + \mathbf{d}_n^{(2)} + \mathbf{d}_n^{(3)} + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}_n} \mathbf{d}_n^{(4,i)} = \mathbf{c}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}), \quad \forall n \in \mathcal{N} \quad (\text{C.23})$$

where $\mathbf{z}_n = (\mathbf{z}_n^{(1)}, \mathbf{z}_n^{(2)}, \mathbf{z}_n^{(3)}, (\mathbf{z}_n^{(4,i)})_{i \in \mathcal{C}_n})$. This finishes the proof.

Appendix D. Specification of formulas

In this section, we specify different parameters (especially vectors and matrices) used in this study for better understanding. We first specify $\mathbf{c}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta})$. As mentioned in Section Appendix A, $\mathbf{c}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \in \mathbb{R}^{|\boldsymbol{\theta}_n|}$ is a vector such that

$$(\mathbf{c}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}))^T \boldsymbol{\theta}_n = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} \left(w_{n,j} \cdot (\boldsymbol{\beta}_j - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{I_n})^T \mathbf{x}_n + (\boldsymbol{\beta}_j - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{I_n})^T \mathbf{v}_{n,j} \right) - Y_n \quad (\text{D.1})$$

Recall that $\boldsymbol{\theta}_n = (\mathbf{w}_n, \mathbf{v}_n, Y_n) = (w_{n,1}, \dots, w_{n,|\mathcal{C}_n|}, v_{n,1}^{(1)}, \dots, v_{n,1}^{(|\mathcal{K}|)}, \dots, v_{n,|\mathcal{C}_n|}^{(1)}, \dots, v_{n,|\mathcal{C}_n|}^{(|\mathcal{K}|)}, Y_n)$. Define:

$$\mathbf{c}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta})^{(1)} = \left((\boldsymbol{\beta}_j - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{I_n})^T \mathbf{x}_n \right)_{j=1, \dots, |\mathcal{C}_n|} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathbf{w}_n|} \quad (\text{D.2})$$

$$\mathbf{c}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta})_j^{(2)} = (\boldsymbol{\beta}_j - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{I_n}) \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{K}|} \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, |\mathcal{C}_n|$$

$$\mathbf{c}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta})^{(3)} = -1 \in \mathbb{R} \quad (\text{D.3})$$

Then we have:

$$\mathbf{c}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \left(\mathbf{c}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta})^{(1)}, \mathbf{c}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta})_1^{(2)}, \dots, \mathbf{c}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta})_{|\mathcal{C}_n|}^{(2)}, \mathbf{c}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta})^{(3)} \right) \in \mathbb{R}^{|\boldsymbol{\theta}_n|} \quad (\text{D.4})$$

Next we will \mathbf{A}_n . Recall that \mathbf{A}_n is defined such that $\mathbf{A}_n \cdot \boldsymbol{\theta}_n = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} \mathbf{v}_{n,j}$. Let $A_n^{(k,l)}$ be the element

of \mathbf{A}_n at k -th row and l -th column, then

$$A_n^{(k,l)} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \theta_{n,l} \in \{v_{n,1}^{(k)}, \dots, v_{n,|\mathcal{C}_n|}^{(k)}\} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (\text{D.5})$$

where $\theta_{n,l}$ is the l -th element of vector $\boldsymbol{\theta}_n$.

To specify \mathbf{B}_n and \mathbf{b}_n , recall that \mathbf{B}_n and \mathbf{b}_n are defined such that $\mathbf{B}_n \cdot \boldsymbol{\theta}_n \leq \mathbf{b}_n \Leftrightarrow$ Constraint B.1c. Substituting $w_{n,1} = 1 - \sum_{j=2, \dots, |\mathcal{C}_n|} w_{n,j}$, Constraint B.1c can be rewritten as:

$$\mathbf{w}_n \geq 0, \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_n} w_{n,j} = 1 \Leftrightarrow \sum_{j=2, \dots, |\mathcal{C}_n|} w_{n,j} \leq 1, -w_{n,j} \leq 0 \forall j = 2, \dots, |\mathcal{C}_n| \quad (\text{D.6})$$

Therefore, we have $\mathbf{b}_n = (1, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{C}_n|}$ (i.e., only the first element is one, all others are zero). Let $B_n^{(k,l)}$ be the element of \mathbf{B}_n at k -th row and l -th column, then

$$B_n^{(k,l)} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } k = 1 \text{ and } l \in \{2, \dots, |\mathcal{C}_n|\} \\ -1 & \text{if } k = l \text{ and } k, l \in \{2, \dots, |\mathcal{C}_n|\} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (\text{D.7})$$

For selection matrices $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{w}_n}$, \mathbf{S}_{Y_n} , $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{v}_{n,i}}$, and $\mathbf{S}_{w_{n,i}}$ are selection matrices, they are defined such that $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{w}_n} \cdot \boldsymbol{\theta}_n = \mathbf{w}_n$, $\mathbf{S}_{Y_n} \cdot \boldsymbol{\theta}_n = Y_n$, $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{v}_{n,i}} \cdot \boldsymbol{\theta}_n = \mathbf{v}_{n,i}$, and $\mathbf{S}_{w_{n,i}} \cdot \boldsymbol{\theta}_n = w_{n,i}$. Therefore:

$$\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{w}_n}^{(k,l)} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \theta_{n,l} \text{ is } w_{n,k} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (\text{D.8})$$

$$\mathbf{S}_{Y_n}^{(k,l)} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } k = 1 \text{ and } l = |\boldsymbol{\theta}_n| \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (\text{D.9})$$

$$\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{v}_{n,i}}^{(k,l)} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \theta_{n,l} \text{ is } v_{n,i}^{(k)} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (\text{D.10})$$

and

$$\mathbf{S}_{w_{n,i}}^{(k,l)} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } k = 1 \text{ and } l = i \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (\text{D.11})$$

References

- Baiocchi, M., Cheng, J., Small, D.S., 2014. Instrumental variable methods for causal inference. *Statistics in medicine* 33, 2297–2340.
- Ben-Akiva, M., Bierlaire, M., 1999. Discrete choice methods and their applications to short term travel decisions, in: *Handbook of transportation science*. Springer, pp. 5–33.
- Ben-Moshe, D., 2014. Identification of dependent nonparametric distributions in a system of linear equations. Maurice Falk Institute for Economic Research in Israel. Discussion paper series. , 2A.

- Ben-Tal, A., Den Hertog, D., Vial, J.P., 2015. Deriving robust counterparts of nonlinear uncertain inequalities. *Mathematical programming* 149, 265–299.
- Bertsimas, D., Dunn, J., Pawlowski, C., Zhuo, Y.D., 2019. Robust classification. *INFORMS Journal on Optimization* 1, 2–34.
- Bertsimas, D., den Hertog, D., 2020. Robust and adaptive optimization. Dynamic Ideas LLC, Belmont, Massachusetts.
- Bertsimas, D., Hertog, D.d., Pauphilet, J., Zhen, J., 2022. Robust convex optimization: A new perspective that unifies and extends. *Mathematical Programming* , 1–42.
- Bertsimas, D., Iancu, D.A., Parrilo, P.A., 2010. Optimality of affine policies in multistage robust optimization. *Mathematics of Operations Research* 35, 363–394.
- Bierlaire, M., Axhausen, K., Abay, G., 2001. The acceptance of modal innovation: The case of swissmetro, in: *Swiss transport research conference*.
- Bowman, J.L., Ben-Akiva, M.E., 2001. Activity-based disaggregate travel demand model system with activity schedules. *Transportation research part a: policy and practice* 35, 1–28.
- Campanelli, P.C., Martin, E.A., Rothgeb, J.M., 1991. The use of respondent and interviewer debriefing studies as a way to study response error in survey data. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series D (The Statistician)* 40, 253–264.
- Fernandes, B., Street, A., Valladão, D., Fernandes, C., 2016. An adaptive robust portfolio optimization model with loss constraints based on data-driven polyhedral uncertainty sets. *European Journal of Operational Research* 255, 961–970.
- Gorissen, B.L., Yanikoğlu, İ., den Hertog, D., 2015. A practical guide to robust optimization. *Omega* 53, 124–137.
- Hausman, J., 2001. Mismeasured variables in econometric analysis: problems from the right and problems from the left. *Journal of Economic perspectives* 15, 57–67.
- Hausman, J.A., Abrevaya, J., Scott-Morton, F.M., 1998. Misclassification of the dependent variable in a discrete-response setting. *Journal of econometrics* 87, 239–269.
- Hu, Y., 2008. Identification and estimation of nonlinear models with misclassification error using instrumental variables: A general solution. *Journal of Econometrics* 144, 27–61.
- Hurst, E., Li, G., Pugsley, B., 2014. Are household surveys like tax forms? evidence from income underreporting of the self-employed. *Review of economics and statistics* 96, 19–33.
- Kreuter, F., Presser, S., Tourangeau, R., 2008. Social desirability bias in cati, ivr, and web surveys: The effects of mode and question sensitivity. *Public opinion quarterly* 72, 847–865.
- Mo, B., Koutsopoulos, H.N., Shen, Z.J.M., Zhao, J., 2023. Robust path recommendations during public transit disruptions under demand uncertainty. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological* 169, 82–107.
- Mo, B., Shen, Y., Zhao, J., 2018. Impact of built environment on first-and last-mile travel mode choice. *Transportation research record* 2672, 40–51.
- Paleti, R., Balan, L., 2019. Misclassification in travel surveys and implications to choice modeling: application to household auto ownership decisions. *Transportation* 46, 1467–1485.
- Schennach, S.M., 2004. Estimation of nonlinear models with measurement error. *Econometrica* 72, 33–75.
- Schennach, S.M., 2016. Recent advances in the measurement error literature. *Annual Review of Economics* 8, 341–377.
- Schennach, S.M., 2019. Convolution without independence. *Journal of econometrics* 211, 308–318.

- Shi, Y., Boudouh, T., Grunder, O., 2019. A robust optimization for a home health care routing and scheduling problem with consideration of uncertain travel and service times. *Transportation Research Part E: Logistics and Transportation Review* 128, 52–95.
- Stopher, P., FitzGerald, C., Xu, M., 2007. Assessing the accuracy of the sydney household travel survey with gps. *Transportation* 34, 723–741.
- Sungur, I., Ordóñez, F., Dessouky, M., 2008. A robust optimization approach for the capacitated vehicle routing problem with demand uncertainty. *Iie Transactions* 40, 509–523.
- Wang, X.F., Wang, B., 2011. Deconvolution estimation in measurement error models: the r package decon. *Journal of statistical software* 39.
- Wang, Y., Zhang, Y., Tang, J., 2019. A distributionally robust optimization approach for surgery block allocation. *European Journal of Operational Research* 273, 740–753.