

Recoverable robust shortest path problem under interval budgeted uncertainty representations

Marcel Jackiewicz¹, Adam Kasperski^{*1}, and Paweł Zieliński¹

¹ Wrocław University of Science and Technology, Wrocław, Poland,
 {marcel.jackiewicz,adam.kasperski,pawel.zielinski}@pwr.edu.pl

July 16, 2024

Abstract

This paper deals with the recoverable robust shortest path problem under interval uncertainty representations. In this problem, a first-stage path is computed, which can be modified to some extent after observing changes in the cost structure. The uncertain second-stage arc costs are modeled by intervals, and the robust min-max criterion is used to compute an optimal solution. The problem is known to be strongly NP-hard and also hard to approximate in general digraphs. However, until now its complexity for acyclic digraphs was unknown. In this paper, it is shown that the problem in acyclic digraphs can be solved in polynomial time for the traditional interval uncertainty and all natural neighborhoods known from the literature. More efficient algorithms for layered and arc series-parallel digraphs are constructed. Hardness results for general digraphs are also strengthened. Finally, some exact and approximate methods of solving the problem under interval budgeted uncertainty are proposed.

Keywords: robust optimization, interval data, recovery, shortest path.

1 Introduction

The concept of recoverable robustness was introduced by Liebchen et al. [31]. This two-stage approach consists in computing a first-stage solution whose cost is known. In the second stage, after the uncertain costs are revealed, a limited recovery action is allowed to modify the first-stage solution. We seek a solution whose total first and second-stage cost is minimal. The recoverable robust approach can be naturally applied to the class of combinatorial optimization problems, where each solution can be represented as a subset of a finite element set. In this case, the recovery action consists in adding some elements to the first-stage solution or excluding some elements from it (see, e.g., [13, 33, 24]). The second-stage uncertainty can be modeled in various ways. We can use the *discrete uncertainty representation* (see, e.g., [27]) by simply listing all possible realizations of the second-stage costs. Alternatively, we can use the *interval uncertainty representation* by providing an interval of possible values for each second-stage cost. This representation is convenient in

*Corresponding author

applications because it requires only a nominal value and a maximum deviation from this nominal value for each uncertain parameter. To control the amount of uncertainty and the price of robustness, budgeted versions of the interval uncertainty can be used [2, 3, 33]. A budget allows us to avoid over-conservatism of the solutions computed. Indeed, it can be unlikely that all the uncertain parameters take their worst values simultaneously. A deeper motivation for using budgets in the interval uncertainty can be found, for example, in [2].

The recoverable robust approach has recently been applied to various combinatorial optimization problems. Under the interval uncertainty representation, the problem can be solved in polynomial time for the class of matroidal problems [30], for example, the selection [26, 28] and minimum spanning tree [22, 21] problems. On the other hand, the problem is strongly NP-hard for the shortest path in general digraphs [8] and assignment [14] problems. Furthermore, the former problem is also hard to approximate even if a very limited recovery action is allowed [8], while the latter one is $W[1]$ -hard with respect to the recovery parameter [14]. In [11, 18], the recoverable robust version of the strongly NP-hard traveling salesperson problem under interval uncertainty has been investigated. Several approximation algorithms for some special cases of this problem were proposed. In [4], the recoverable robust version of a single-machine scheduling problem with interval job processing times was discussed. Some approximation algorithms for this problem were proposed.

Adding budgets to the interval uncertainty makes solving the recoverable robust problem challenging. Polynomial-time algorithms are known only for some very special cases, such as the selection problem under the *continuous budgeted uncertainty* [33], constructed in [12]. The complexity of the analogous problem for the minimum spanning tree remains open. For the discrete budgeted uncertainty [3], a compact mixed integer programming model for the recoverable robust selection problem can be constructed [12]. For the analogous recoverable robust version of the minimum spanning tree problem, computing a worst scenario for a given first-stage solution (the adversarial problem) is already strongly NP-hard [33]. In [9, 10], the recoverable robust knapsack problem with the budgeted uncertainty in the item weights was investigated. A compact mixed integer programming formulation for this problem was presented. Generally, the recoverable robust combinatorial problems under budgeted interval uncertainty can be solved using a row generation algorithm described in [23, 37]. However, this algorithm is efficient only for problems of small size. Designing more efficient methods for particular problems is still very challenging.

In this paper, we focus on the recoverable, robust version of the shortest path problem. This problem was first investigated in [7, 8], and a closely related problem, called the incremental one, was also previously discussed in [13]. In the traditional shortest path problem, we are given a directed graph with arc costs, and we seek a simple shortest path between two specified nodes. This well-known network problem can be solved in polynomial time in general digraphs, assuming that the arc costs are nonnegative, and in acyclic digraphs for arbitrary costs (see, e.g., [1]). The complexity of its recoverable robust version can be much worse. The paths resulting from a recovery action form the so-called neighborhood of a given first-stage path. It turns out that even computing an optimal recovery action for a given second-stage scenario is strongly NP-hard for some natural neighborhoods [13, 33]. Furthermore, computing the optimal first and second-stage paths is strongly NP-hard for all natural neighborhoods [8, 33]. This is, however, the case in general digraphs. Until now, the complexity of the problem for acyclic digraphs has been open. In this paper, we close this gap and show that the recoverable robust shortest path problem in acyclic multidigraphs, under interval uncertainty, can be solved in polynomial time. This fact remains valid for

all neighborhoods discussed in the literature. We construct polynomial time algorithms for general acyclic digraphs and show that the running time can be improved for layered and arc series-parallel digraphs. We also strengthen the hardness results for general digraphs. Namely, we show that the recoverable robust shortest path problem is strongly NP-hard and hard to approximate for digraphs which are near acyclic planar ones. In the second part of the paper, we discuss the robust version of the problem with budgeted interval uncertainty. We show that the problem with the continuous budgeted uncertainty can be solved by using a compact mixed integer programming formulation. Furthermore, the polynomial time algorithms for acyclic digraphs and the interval uncertainty allow us to construct efficient approximation algorithms for both continuous and discrete budgeted uncertainty.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we recall the formulation of the recoverable robust shortest path problem with various neighborhoods and several interval uncertainty representations. We also recall the definitions of the inner adversarial and incremental problems. In Section 3, we discuss the case of the traditional interval uncertainty. We strengthen the known complexity results for general digraphs and show that the problem can be solved in polynomial time for acyclic multidigraphs. We present several polynomial time algorithms for this class of graphs. In Section 4, we discuss the recoverable robust shortest path problem with the budgeted interval uncertainty. We construct a compact mixed integer programming formulation for the continuous case while strengthening some known complexity results for the discrete case. Finally, we propose several approximation algorithms for the class of acyclic multidigraphs.

2 Recoverable robust shortest path problem

In the *shortest path problem* (SP), we are given a *multidigraph* $G = (V, A)$ that consists of a finite set of nodes V , $|V| = n$, and a finite multiset of arcs A , $|A| = m$. Two nodes $s \in V$ and $t \in V$ are distinguished as the *starting node* and the *destination node*, respectively. In particular, node s is called *source* if no arc enters s , and node t is called *sink* if no arc leaves t . Let Φ be the set of all simple s - t paths in G . We will identify each path $X \in \Phi$ with the corresponding set of arcs that form X . A deterministic cost is associated with each arc of G , and we seek a simple s - t path in G with the minimum total cost. The shortest path problem can be solved efficiently using several polynomial-time algorithms (see, e.g., [1]).

In the *recoverable robust* version of SP (REC ROB SP for short), we are given first-stage arc costs $C_e \geq 0$, $e \in A$, which are known in advance. On the other hand, the second-stage arc costs are uncertain, and their particular realization $S = (c_e^S)_{e \in A}$ is called a *scenario*. The set of all possible scenarios is specified as a *scenario (uncertainty) set* $\mathbb{U} \subset \mathbb{R}_+^{|A|}$. The decision process in REC ROB SP is two-stage and consists in choosing a path $X \in \Phi$ in the first stage. Then, in the second stage (the recovery stage), after a scenario $S \in \mathbb{U}$ is revealed, the path X can be modified to some extent. This modification consists in finding a shortest path Y under the cost scenario S in a *neighborhood* of X , denoted by $\Phi(X, k) \subseteq \Phi$. This neighborhood depends on a given *recovery parameter* k , being an integer such that $0 \leq k \leq |A|$. In this paper, we examine the following variants of the neighborhood $\Phi(X, k)$

(see, e.g., [13, 33]):

$$\Phi^{\text{incl}}(X, k) = \{Y \in \Phi : |Y \setminus X| \leq k\}, \quad (1)$$

$$\Phi^{\text{excl}}(X, k) = \{Y \in \Phi : |X \setminus Y| \leq k\}, \quad (2)$$

$$\Phi^{\text{sym}}(X, k) = \{Y \in \Phi : |(Y \setminus X) \cup (X \setminus Y)| \leq k\} \quad (3)$$

called the *arc inclusion neighborhood* (at most k new arcs can be added to X), the *arc exclusion neighborhood* (at most k arcs can be removed from X), and the *arc symmetric difference neighborhood* (at most k arcs can be different in X and Y), respectively.

The goal in REC ROB SP is to find a first-stage path $X \in \Phi$ and a second-stage path $Y \in \Phi(X, k)$ which minimize the total cost in a worst second-stage cost scenario $S \in \mathbb{U}$. Therefore, the problem can be stated as follows:

$$\text{REC ROB SP} : \min_{X \in \Phi} \left(\sum_{e \in X} C_e + \max_{S \in \mathbb{U}} \min_{Y \in \Phi(X, k)} \sum_{e \in Y} c_e^S \right). \quad (4)$$

The REC ROB SP problem contains two inner problems. The first one is the *adversarial problem*, in which an *adversary* wants to find, for a given first-stage path $X \in \Phi$, a scenario that leads to the greatest increase in the cost of a shortest path from $\Phi(X, k)$:

$$\text{ADV SP} : \max_{S \in \mathbb{U}} \min_{Y \in \Phi(X, k)} \sum_{e \in Y} c_e^S. \quad (5)$$

The REC ROB SP problem reduces to ADV SP when we set $C_e = 0$ if $e \in X$ and $C_e = M$ otherwise, where M is a sufficiently large number. Indeed, the fixed path X is then the only reasonable choice in the first stage.

In the second inner problem, called the *incremental problem*, the goal is to make some modifications of X that consist in finding a cheapest path $Y \in \Phi(X, k)$ under the cost scenario S in order to adjust X to the cost realization:

$$\text{INC SP} : \min_{Y \in \Phi(X, k)} \sum_{e \in Y} c_e^S, \quad (6)$$

where path $X \in \Phi$ is given, and the uncertain second-stage arc costs are realized in the form of the scenario S . This problem models the decision making in the second stage. The REC ROB SP problem reduces to INC SP if $\mathbb{U} = \{S\}$, $C_e = 0$ if $e \in X$ and $C_e = M$, otherwise. Observe that the hardness of the adversarial (or incremental) problem immediately implies the hardness of REC ROB SP.

Let \hat{c}_e be a *nominal* second-stage cost of arc $e \in A$ and let $\Delta_e \geq 0$ be the maximum deviation of the second-stage cost of e from its nominal value. In this paper, we use the *interval uncertainty*, so we assume that $c_e^S \in [\hat{c}_e, \hat{c}_e + \Delta_e]$ for each $e \in A$. We will consider three particular cases of the interval uncertainty, namely $\mathbb{U} \in \{\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{U}(\Gamma^d), \mathcal{U}(\Gamma^c)\}$, where

$$\mathcal{U} = \{S = (c_e^S)_{e \in A} : c_e^S \in [\hat{c}_e, \hat{c}_e + \Delta_e], e \in A\}, \quad (7)$$

$$\mathcal{U}(\Gamma^d) = \{S = (c_e^S)_{e \in A} \in \mathcal{U} : |\{e \in A : c_e^S > \hat{c}_e\}| \leq \Gamma^d\}, \quad (8)$$

$$\mathcal{U}(\Gamma^c) = \{S = (c_e^S)_{e \in A} \in \mathcal{U} : \sum_{e \in A} (c_e^S - \hat{c}_e) \leq \Gamma^c\}. \quad (9)$$

Notice that \mathcal{U} is the traditional interval uncertainty set, being the Cartesian product of the uncertainty intervals. The sets $\mathcal{U}(\Gamma^d)$ and $\mathcal{U}(\Gamma^c)$ are budgeted versions of \mathcal{U} , where $\mathcal{U}(\Gamma^d)$ is called *discrete budgeted uncertainty* [2, 3] and $\mathcal{U}(\Gamma^c)$ is called *continuous budgeted uncertainty* [33]. The parameters $\Gamma^d \in \{0, \dots, |A|\}$ and $\Gamma^c \in \mathbb{R}_+$ are called *budgets* and allow us to control the amount of uncertainty in \mathcal{U} . The parameter Γ^d limits the number of second-stage costs that can deviate from their nominal values. On the other hand, the parameter Γ^c limits the total deviation of the second-stage costs from their nominal values. In the following we will use $\mathbb{U} \in \{\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{U}(\Gamma^d), \mathcal{U}(\Gamma^c)\}$ in (4)–(6). Observe that \mathcal{U} is a special case of $\mathcal{U}(\Gamma^d)$ and $\mathcal{U}(\Gamma^c)$ when the budgets are sufficiently large.

If the recovery parameter $k = 0$, then the first and the second-stage paths must be identical. The REC ROB SP problem is then equivalent to the min-max shortest path problem (MINMAX SP) in which we seek a path minimizing the largest cost in scenario sets \mathcal{U}' , $\mathcal{U}'(\Gamma^c)$, $\mathcal{U}'(\Gamma^d)$, where $\hat{c}'_e = C_e + \hat{c}_e$ and $\Delta'_e = \Delta_e$ for each $e \in A$. The MINMAX SP problem can be solved in polynomial time by solving a family of deterministic shortest paths problems (see, e.g., [2, 29]). From now on, we will assume that the recovery parameter $k \geq 1$.

3 The Rec Rob SP problem under the interval uncertainty

In this section, we consider the REC ROB SP problem under the interval uncertainty \mathcal{U} . We begin by observing that, in this case, the adversarial problem (5) can be simplified. Indeed, it is easily seen that

$$\max_{S \in \mathcal{U}} \min_{Y \in \Phi(X, k)} \sum_{e \in Y} c_e^S = \min_{Y \in \Phi(X, k)} \sum_{e \in Y} (\hat{c}_e + \Delta_e).$$

Thus, ADV SP becomes the INC SP problem under the upper bound scenario $(\hat{c}_e + \Delta_e)_{e \in A}$. Hence, the REC ROB SP under \mathcal{U} also simplifies and is equivalent to the following problem:

$$\text{REC SP} : \min_{X \in \Phi} \left(\sum_{e \in X} C_e + \min_{Y \in \Phi(X, k)} \sum_{e \in Y} \bar{c}_e \right) = \min_{X \in \Phi, Y \in \Phi(X, k)} \left(\sum_{e \in X} C_e + \sum_{e \in Y} \bar{c}_e \right), \quad (10)$$

called the *recoverable shortest path problem*, where \bar{c}_e stands for $\hat{c}_e + \Delta_e$ for each $e \in A$. Thus, throughout this section, we will study the REC SP problem instead of the REC ROB SP under \mathcal{U} and the INC SP problem instead of ADV SP.

Table 1 summarizes the results obtained later in this section. We will first strengthen the known hardness results for general digraphs. We then construct polynomial time algorithms for various classes of acyclic multidigraphs.

3.1 Recoverable shortest path problem in general multidigraphs

In this section we strengthen known hardness results for REC SP with the neighborhoods $\Phi^{\text{incl}}(X, k)$, $\Phi^{\text{excl}}(X, k)$ and $\Phi^{\text{sym}}(X, k)$ and show compact mixed integer programming formulation for it (MIP for short).

3.1.1 Hardness results

We now analyze the computational complexity of the INC SP and REC SP problems with the neighborhoods $\Phi^{\text{incl}}(X, k)$, $\Phi^{\text{excl}}(X, k)$ and $\Phi^{\text{sym}}(X, k)$. We refine the known results in this

Table 1: Summary of the results for REC SP under the interval uncertainty \mathcal{U} for various classes of multidigraphs and neighborhoods.

| Multidigraph | Neighborhoods | | |
|---------------------------|---|---|--|
| | $\Phi^{\text{incl}}(X, k)$ | $\Phi^{\text{excl}}(X, k)$ | $\Phi^{\text{sym}}(X, k)$ |
| General | strongly NP-hard not approximable for $k = 2$ [8] | strongly NP-hard not approximable for $k = 2$ [13] | strongly NP-hard not approximable for unbounded k [33] |
| | para-NP-hard | para-NP-hard | |
| | compact MIP | compact MIP | compact MIP |
| Nearly acyclic planar* | strongly NP-hard not approximable for unbounded k | strongly NP-hard not approximable for unbounded k | ? |
| General acyclic | $O(V ^2 A k^2)$ | $O(V ^2 A k^2)$ | $O(V ^2 A k^3)$ |
| Layered | $O(A V + V ^2k)$ | $O(A V + V ^2k)$ | $O(A V + V ^2k)$ |
| Arc series-parallel | $O(A k^2)$ | $O(A k^2)$ | $O(A k^2)$ |

*Multidigraph that becomes acyclic planar after removing $O(k)$ arcs.

area by providing hardness results for digraphs with a simpler structure, i.e. for the digraphs near acyclic planar ones. We call them *nearly acyclic planar digraphs*. A digraph is nearly acyclic planar if it becomes acyclic planar after removing $O(k)$ arcs.

Consider first the neighborhood $\Phi^{\text{incl}}(X, k)$. In this case, the INC SP problem in a general digraph $G = (V, A)$ can be solved in $O(k|A|)$ time [13], while in [8, Corollary 4] Büsing proved that the REC SP problem is strongly NP-hard and not approximable in a general digraph unless $P = NP$, even if the recovery parameter $k = 2$. The proof shown in [8] uses a reduction from the 2-vertex disjoint paths problem, which is strongly NP-complete in general digraphs [16]. We now generalize this reduction and show that REC SP remains hard for nearly acyclic planar digraphs.

We start by recalling the definition of the *K-Vertex-Disjoint Paths Problem* (*K-V-DP* for short). We are given a digraph $G = (V, A)$ and K terminal pairs (s_i, t_i) , where $s_i, t_i \in V$, $i \in [K] = \{1, \dots, K\}$, are pairwise distinct vertices. We ask whether there exist K pairwise vertex-disjoint paths π_1, \dots, π_K in G such that π_i is a simple s_i - t_i path for each $i \in [K]$.




Figure 1: A graph $G + H$ used in the reductions in the proofs of Lemmas 1 and 2. The bold arcs form the graph H .

Let $G = (V, A)$ and $H = (V_H, A_H)$ be two digraphs such that $V_H \subseteq V$. We will denote by $G + H$ the multidigraph having the set of nodes V and the set of arcs containing all the arcs from A and A_H .

Lemma 1. *There is a polynomial time reduction from K -V-DP in a digraph G to REC SP with $\Phi^{\text{incl}}(X, k)$, $k = K$, in a digraph $G + H$ with costs $(C_e, \bar{c}_e) \in \{(0, 0), (1, 0), (0, 1)\}$ for all arcs e in $G + H$, where digraph H is a simple path containing $2k - 1$ arcs, $|A_H| = 2k - 1$. Moreover, an instance of K -V-DP is a Yes-instance iff the total cost of any optimal solution to the corresponding instance of REC SP is zero.*

Proof. The reduction presented here is a generalization, with some simplifications, of the one given in [8, Corollary 4] to the case of K terminal pairs. Given an instance of the K -V-DP problem in a digraph $G = (V, A)$, we built the corresponding instance of REC SP as follows. We add $2K - 1$ arcs to graph G , i.e. the arcs (s_i, t_i) with the costs $C_{s_i t_i} = 1$, $\bar{c}_{s_i t_i} = 0$, $i \in [K]$, and the arcs (t_i, s_{i+1}) with the costs $C_{t_i s_{i+1}} = 0$, $\bar{c}_{t_i s_{i+1}} = 0$, $i \in [K - 1]$. These arcs form the simple s - t path H , where $s = s_1$ and $t = t_K$ (see Figure 1). The rest of the arcs of the graph $G + H$, i.e. the arcs of the original graph G , have the costs $C_e = 0$ and $\bar{c}_e = 1$, $e \in A$. Finally, we set $k = K$. We show that the answer to K -V-DP is yes iff the total cost of any optimal solution to the corresponding instance of REC SP is zero.

(\Rightarrow) Assume that the answer to an instance of K -V-DP is yes. Thus, there exist K pairwise vertex-disjoint paths π_1, \dots, π_K in G such that π_i is a simple s_i - t_i path for each $i \in [K]$. Hence, the pair of simple s - t paths $X^* = (\pi_1, (t_1, s_2), \pi_2, (t_2, s_2), \dots, \pi_K)$ and $H = ((s_1, t_1), (t_1, s_2), (s_2, t_2), \dots, (s_K, t_K)) \in \Phi^{\text{incl}}(X^*, k)$ is an optimal solution to the corresponding instance of REC SP with the total cost of zero.

(\Leftarrow) Let X^* and $Y^* \in \Phi^{\text{incl}}(X^*, k)$ be an optimal pair of the first and second stage simple s - t paths in $G + H$. Because the second-stage cost of Y^* is 0, $Y^* = H$, as H is the only s - t path in $G + H$ with the second-stage cost equal to 0. On the other hand, the arcs (s_i, t_i) for $i \in [K]$ cannot appear in X^* because their first stage costs are positive. In what follows, all the arcs (t_i, s_{i+1}) , $i \in [K - 1]$, must be present in X^* , since otherwise we had to add more than k arcs to X^* to obtain Y^* . Since X^* is a simple s - t path in G , it connects nodes s_i and t_i , $i \in [K]$, by arcs that only belong to G . Hence, there must exist K node disjoint simple paths π_i between s_i and t_i , $i \in [K]$, respectively, in G . \square

From Lemma 1 and the complexity of K -V-DP for $K = 2$ in general digraphs [16], we immediately obtain the aforementioned Büsing's hardness results for REC SP when $k = 2$. In this case, H is a simple 3-arc path (only three arcs are added to G). It turns out that if K is part of the input, then K -V-DP remains strongly NP-hard for acyclic planar digraphs [34]. Lemma 1 implies then the following result:

Theorem 1. *The REC SP problem with $\Phi^{\text{incl}}(X, k)$ in a digraph $G + H$ with costs $(C_e, \bar{c}_e) \in \{(0, 0), (1, 0), (0, 1)\}$ for all arcs e in $G + H$ is strongly NP-hard and not approximable unless $P = NP$, if G is a planar digraph, k is part of the input, and H is a simple path having $2k - 1$ arcs.*

The inapproximability result follows from the fact that any approximation algorithm for REC SP would detect in polynomial time a solution with the cost equal to 0. We will show in Section 3.2 that REC SP is polynomially solvable in acyclic digraphs. Theorem 1 shows that it is enough to add $2k - 1$ arcs to an acyclic planar digraph to make REC SP computationally hard problem.

Let us look at the REC SP problem from the parameterized complexity point of view, namely we show that the decision version of REC SP, parameterized by the recovery parameter k , is para-NP-complete. The class para-NP is the class of all parameterized problems, with some parameter κ , that can be solved by a nondeterministic algorithm in $f(\kappa) \cdot |\mathcal{I}|^{O(1)}$ time, where f is a computable function and $|\mathcal{I}|$ is the size of the instance \mathcal{I} of the problem (see, e.g., [15]). A *slice* of a parameterized problem is its non-parameterized counterpart, obtained by setting κ to a constant value. If a slice of a parameterized problem is NP-hard, then the problem is para-NP-hard. We will use this fact in our proofs. It is known that $\text{FPT} = \text{para-NP}$ if and only if $\text{P} = \text{NP}$, where the FPT class consists of all parameterized problems that can be solved in $f(\kappa) \cdot |\mathcal{I}|^{O(1)}$ time, i.e. the problems, which are *fixed-parameter tractable* (see, e.g., [15] for an in-depth treatment of the parameterized complexity). Therefore, para-NP-completeness of a parameterized problem excludes the existence of algorithms for the problem whose running time could contain an exponential term with respect to parameter κ only.

Theorem 2. *The decision version of REC SP with $\Phi^{\text{incl}}(X, k)$ parameterized by k is para-NP-complete in general digraphs.*

Proof. The problem REC SP is in NP because INC SP (ADV SP) with $\Phi^{\text{incl}}(X, k)$ can be solved in $O(k|A|)$ time [13]. Hence, REC SP belongs to para-NP. Since REC SP is NP-hard for constant k ($k = 2$) [8], it is para-NP-hard (see [15, Theorem 2.14]). Thus, it is para-NP-complete in general digraphs. \square

It follows from Theorem 2 that REC SP with $\Phi^{\text{incl}}(X, k)$ parameterized by k is para-NP-hard in general digraphs. We now consider the arc exclusion neighborhood $\Phi^{\text{excl}}(X, k)$. For this case, the INC SP problem is already strongly NP-hard and not approximable in general digraphs, even if the recovery parameter $k = 2$, by a reduction from the 2-V-DP problem [13]. Again, we generalize this reduction to show that INC SP remains hard for nearly acyclic planar digraphs.

Lemma 2. *There is a polynomial time reduction from K -V-DP in a digraph $G = (V, A)$ to INC SP with $\Phi^{\text{excl}}(X, k)$, $k = K$, in a digraph $G + H$ with $\bar{c}_e \in \{0, 1\}$ for all arcs e in $G + H$, where H is a simple path having $2k - 1$ arcs, $|A_H| = 2k - 1$. Moreover, an instance of K -V-DP is a Yes-instance iff the total cost of any optimal solution to the corresponding instance of INC SP is zero.*

Proof. Given an instance of the K -V-DP problem in a digraph $G = (V, A)$, we add $2K - 1$ arcs to graph G , i.e. arcs (s_i, t_i) with the costs $\bar{c}_{s_i t_i} = 1$, $i \in [K]$, and arcs (t_i, s_{i+1}) with the costs $\bar{c}_{t_i s_{i+1}} = 0$, $i \in [K - 1]$. These new arcs form the simple s - t path H , where $s = s_1$ and $t = t_K$ (see Figure 1). The rest of the arcs of the graph $G + H$, i.e. the arcs of the original G , have costs $\bar{c}_e = 0$, $e \in A$. Let $X = H$ and fix $k = K$. The cost of an optimal solution Y^* to INC SP is 0 iff all K arcs (s_i, t_i) , $i \in [K]$, are removed from X and all the arcs (t_i, s_{i+1}) for $i \in [K - 1]$ are present in Y^* (as at most K arcs can be removed from X). Because Y^* is a simple path, there are K vertex disjoint paths π_1, \dots, π_K between s_i and t_i , $i \in [K]$, in G . \square

Lemma 2 and the strong NP-completeness of K -V-DP for $K = 2$ in general digraphs [16] lead to the hardness result for INC SP with $\Phi^{\text{excl}}(X, k)$ when $k = 2$, presented in [13]. By Lemma 2 and the fact that K -V-DP is strongly NP-complete in acyclic planar digraphs when K is part of the input [34], we obtain the following hardness result for simpler digraphs:

Theorem 3. *The INC SP problem with $\Phi^{\text{excl}}(X, k)$ in a digraph $G + H$ with costs $\bar{c}_e \in \{0, 1\}$ for all arcs e in $G + H$ is strongly NP-hard and not approximable unless $P = NP$, if G is a planar digraph, k is part of the input and H is a simple path having $2k - 1$ arcs.*

We have the result analogous to Theorem 2 for the arc exclusion neighborhood.

Theorem 4. *The decision version of INC SP with $\Phi^{\text{excl}}(X, k)$ parameterized by k is para-NP-complete in general digraphs.*

Proof. Clearly INC SP is in NP, and so it is in para-NP. Since INC SP is NP-hard for $k = 2$ [13], it is para-NP-hard (see [15, Theorem 2.14]). Thus, it is para-NP-complete in general digraphs. \square

Finally, consider the arc symmetric difference neighborhood $\Phi^{\text{sym}}(X, k)$. It was shown in [33] that INC SP with $\Phi^{\text{sym}}(X, k)$ is strongly NP-hard even if the recovery parameter k is part of the input. A simple and straightforward modification of the reduction from [33] (it is enough to change some arc costs) allows us to establish the inapproximability of INC SP also for this case.

Theorem 5. *The INC SP problem in general digraphs with $\Phi^{\text{sym}}(X, k)$ is strongly NP-hard and not approximable unless $P = NP$ if k is part of the input.*

Since INC SP is a special case of REC SP, all the hardness results for $\Phi^{\text{excl}}(X, k)$ and $\Phi^{\text{sym}}(X, k)$ remain valid for REC SP with these neighborhoods. Hence, REC SP is a computationally hard problem for all neighborhoods under consideration. Notice, however, that the hardness results shown in this section hold for general digraphs. In Section 3.2, we will show that REC SP can be solved in polynomial time for all the considered neighborhoods if the input graph is an acyclic multidigraph.

3.1.2 Compact mixed integer programming formulation

In this section, we will show that REC SP in general multidigraphs can be solved using a compact MIP. Let $\chi(\Phi) \subset \{0, 1\}^{|A|}$ be the set of characteristic vectors of simple s - t paths in $G = (V, A)$. In the following, we will identify each simple s - t path X with its characteristic vector $\mathbf{x} \in \chi(\Phi)$. Likewise, $\chi(\Phi(\mathbf{x}, k)) \subset \{0, 1\}^{|A|}$ is the set of characteristic vectors of simple s - t paths in the neighborhood of $\mathbf{x} \in \chi(\Phi)$. Define $d_i = 1$ if $i = s$, $d_i = -1$ if $i = t$ and $d_i = 0$ for $i \in V \setminus \{s, t\}$. The MIP formulation for REC SP takes the following form:

$$\min \sum_{e \in A} C_e x_e + \sum_{e \in A} \bar{c}_e y_e \quad (11)$$

$$\mathbf{x} \in \chi(\Phi) \subset \{0, 1\}^{|A|}, \quad (12)$$

$$\mathbf{y} \in \chi(\Phi(\mathbf{x}, k)) \subset \{0, 1\}^{|A|}, \quad (13)$$

where $\chi(\Phi)$ is described by the following constraints:

$$\sum_{(i,j) \in A} x_{i,j} - \sum_{(j,i) \in A} x_{j,i} = d_i \quad i \in V, \quad (14)$$

$$x_{i,s} = x_{t,i} = 0 \quad i \in V, \quad (15)$$

$$p_i + M x_{i,j} + 1 \leq p_j + M \quad (i, j) \in A, \quad (16)$$

$$p_i \in \{1, \dots, |V|\} \quad i \in V, \quad (17)$$

$$x_{i,j} \in \{0, 1\} \quad (i, j) \in A, \quad (18)$$

where M is a sufficiently large constant. Constraints (14) are standard mass-balance constraints (see, e.g., [1]). Constraints (15)–(17) must be added to ensure that \mathbf{x} describes a simple path in G . They form a system of Miller-Tucker-Zemlin type constraints that exclude directed cycles in \mathbf{x} (see, e.g. [6, 32]). Of course, these constraints can be omitted if G is acyclic and $\chi(\Phi)$ is then described only by (14) and (18). For general digraphs (15)–(17) must be added, even if all first-stage arc costs are positive. This fact is demonstrated by an example shown in Appendix A. The set $\chi(\Phi(\mathbf{x}, k))$ can be modeled by the following constraints:

$$\chi(\Phi^{\text{incl}}(\mathbf{x}, k)) : \quad \mathbf{y} \in \chi(\Phi), \quad \sum_{e \in A} (1 - x_e)y_e \leq k, \quad (19)$$

$$\chi(\Phi^{\text{excl}}(\mathbf{x}, k)) : \quad \mathbf{y} \in \chi(\Phi), \quad \sum_{e \in A} (1 - y_e)x_e \leq k, \quad (20)$$

$$\chi(\Phi^{\text{sym}}(\mathbf{x}, k)) : \quad \mathbf{y} \in \chi(\Phi) \quad \sum_{e \in A} ((1 - x_e)y_e + (1 - y_e)x_e) \leq k. \quad (21)$$

By the assumption that $\mathbb{U} \subset \mathbb{R}_+^{|A|}$ (the second-stage arc costs are nonnegative), we can drop the anti-cycling constraints in the description of $\chi(\Phi^{\text{incl}}(\mathbf{x}, k))$. Indeed, a solution $\mathbf{y} \in \chi(\Phi^{\text{incl}}(\mathbf{x}, k))$ contains a simple s - t path and possibly some cycles. We can remove all such cycles by fixing some variables y_e to 0, without violating the constraint (19). However, we cannot do this for the arc exclusion and arc symmetric difference neighborhoods (an example is shown in Appendix A). Therefore, for general digraphs, the anti-cycling constraints must be present in the description of $\chi(\Phi^{\text{excl}}(\mathbf{x}, k))$ and $\chi(\Phi^{\text{sym}}(\mathbf{x}, k))$. The constraints in (19)–(21) can be linearized. For example, we can replace (19) with

$$\sum_{e \in A} (y_e - z_e) \leq k \quad (22)$$

$$z_e \leq x_e \quad \forall e \in A, \quad (23)$$

$$z_e \leq y_e \quad \forall e \in A, \quad (24)$$

$$z_e \geq 0 \quad \forall e \in A. \quad (25)$$

In much the same way, we can linearize the constraints (20) and (21). We conclude that the REC SP problem with $\Phi^{\text{incl}}(X, k)$, $\Phi^{\text{excl}}(X, k)$ and $\Phi^{\text{sym}}(X, k)$ admits compact MIP formulations.

3.2 Recoverable shortest path problem in acyclic multidigraphs

In this section we show that REC SP with the neighborhoods $\Phi^{\text{incl}}(X, k)$, $\Phi^{\text{excl}}(X, k)$ and $\Phi^{\text{sym}}(X, k)$ can be solved in polynomial time if the input graph G is an acyclic multidigraph. Observe that we can drop the assumption about the non-negativity of arc costs for this class of graphs. We first assume that G is layered, and then we will generalize the result to arbitrary acyclic multidigraphs.

3.2.1 Layered multidigraphs

In a layered multidigraph $G = (V, A)$, the set of nodes V is partitioned into ℓ disjoint subsets called layers, i.e. $V = V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_\ell$, and the arcs connect only the nodes in successive layers, i.e. go only from nodes in V_h to nodes in V_{h+1} for each $h \in [\ell - 1]$. Without loss of generality, we

can assume $s \in V_1$ and $t \in V_\ell$. In layered multidigraphs all s - t paths have the same cardinality. Therefore, for every path $X \in \Phi$ and any $k = 0, \dots, \ell - 1$, $\Phi^{\text{incl}}(X, k) = \Phi^{\text{excl}}(X, k)$. Also $\Phi^{\text{sym}}(X, k) = \Phi^{\text{incl}}(X, \lfloor k/2 \rfloor)$. Therefore, it is enough to construct an algorithm for the arc inclusion neighborhood $\Phi^{\text{incl}}(X, k)$.

In the following, we will show a polynomial transformation from REC SP in a layered multidigraph to the Constrained Shortest Path Problem (CSP for short) in an acyclic multidigraph. In the CSP problem, we are given an acyclic multidigraph $G = (V, A)$ with a source $s \in V$ and a sink $t \in V$. Each arc $e \in A$ has a cost c_e and a transition time t_e . A positive total transition time limit T is specified. We seek an s - t path π in G that minimizes the total cost, subject to not exceeding the transition time limit T . The CSP is known to be weakly NP-hard (see, e.g., [17]) and can be solved in $O(|A|T)$ time, which is pseudopolynomial [20].

Lemma 3. *There is a polynomial time reduction from the REC SP problem with the neighborhoods $\Phi^{\text{incl}}(X, k)$, $\Phi^{\text{excl}}(X, k)$ and $\Phi^{\text{sym}}(X, k)$ in a layered multidigraph $G = (V, A)$ to the CSP problem in an acyclic multidigraph with $T = k$.*

Proof. Let $G = (V, A)$ be a layered multidigraph in an instance of REC SP with a recovery parameter k . We will show a construction for the arc inclusion neighborhood $\Phi^{\text{incl}}(X, k)$. We build an acyclic multidigraph $G' = (V', A')$ in the corresponding instance of CSP as follows. We fix $V' = V$, $s' = s$, $t' = t$, and A' contains two types of arcs labelled as $e^{(0)}$ and $e^{(1)}$. Namely, for each pair of nodes $i \in V_h$ and $j \in V_{h+1}$, $h \in [\ell - 1]$, such that there exists at least one arc from i to j (note that G can be a multidigraph), we add to A' arc $e^{(0)} = (i, j)$ with the cost $c_{e^{(0)}} = \min_{e=(u,v) \in A: u=i, v=j} \{C_e + \bar{c}_e\}$ and the transition time $t_{e^{(0)}} = 0$. For each pair of nodes $i \in V_g$ and $j \in V_h$, $g, h \in [\ell]$, such that the node j is reachable from i and $1 \leq h - g \leq k$, we add to A' arc $e^{(1)} = (i, j)$ with the cost $c_{e^{(1)}}$ being the sum of the cost of a shortest path X_{ij}^* from i to j under C_e , $e \in A$, and the cost of a shortest path Y_{ij}^* from i to j under \bar{c}_e , $e \in A$, i.e. $c_{e^{(1)}} = \sum_{e \in X_{ij}^*} C_e + \sum_{e \in Y_{ij}^*} \bar{c}_e$. The transition time is $t_{e^{(1)}} = |Y_{ij}^* \setminus X_{ij}^*|$. Since G is layered, $|X_{ij}^*| = |Y_{ij}^*| = h - g$ and thus $|Y_{ij}^* \setminus X_{ij}^*| \leq h - g$. Finally, we set $T = k$. The graph G' can be constructed in $O(|A||V|)$ time. Indeed, given a node $i \in V$, we can compute in $O(|A|)$ time the paths X_{ij}^* and Y_{ij}^* , for all $j \in V$ reachable from i , using a dynamic programming algorithm (see, e.g. [1]). This algorithm must be executed $O(|V|)$ times, which yields the overall running time $O(|A||V|)$.

We need to show that there is a pair of paths $X \in \Phi$ and $Y \in \Phi^{\text{incl}}(X, k)$ in G , feasible to REC SP, with the cost $\sum_{e \in X} C_e + \sum_{e \in Y} \bar{c}_e \leq UB$ if and only if there is a path π in G' , feasible to CSP, such that $\sum_{e \in \pi} c_e \leq UB$, where $UB \in \mathbb{R}$.

(\Rightarrow) Let $X \in \Phi$ and $Y \in \Phi^{\text{incl}}(X, k)$ be a pair of paths, feasible to REC SP in G , with the cost $\sum_{e \in X} C_e + \sum_{e \in Y} \bar{c}_e \leq UB$. We form the corresponding s - t path π in G' as follows. Let (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_l) , where $i_1 = s$ and $i_l = t$ be the sequence of the common nodes of paths X and Y in the order of visiting. This sequence is the same for X and Y because G is acyclic (an example is shown in Figure 2). For each $i = 2, \dots, l$, if $e = (i_{j-1}, i_j) \in X \cap Y$, then we add to π the arc $e^{(0)} = (i_j, i_{j-1}) \in A'$. Notice that the cost of $e^{(0)}$ is not greater than $C_e + \bar{c}_e$ and its transition time is 0. If $e = (i_{j-1}, i_j) \notin X \cap Y$, then there are two disjoint subpaths X' of X and Y' of Y from i_{j-1} to i_j in G . In this case, we add to π the arc $e^{(1)} = (i_j, i_{j-1}) \in A'$. Notice that the cost of $e^{(1)}$ is not greater than $\sum_{e \in X'} C_e + \sum_{e \in Y'} \bar{c}_e$, because it is the sum of the costs of the shortest $i_{j-1} - i_j$ paths with respect to C_e and \bar{c}_e . Also, the transition time of $e^{(1)}$ is not greater than $|Y' \setminus X'|$, which follows from the layered structure of the input

graph G (notice that $|Y' \setminus X'|$ is equal to the number of layers between i_{j-1} and i_j). The arc $e^{(0)}$ (resp. $e^{(1)}$) must exist in G' , because i_j is reachable from i_{j-1} in G . Therefore, π is an s - t path in G' . It is also feasible because its total transition time is at most $|Y \setminus X| \leq k$. Finally, the total cost of π is not greater than $\sum_{e \in X} C_e + \sum_{e \in Y} \bar{c}_e \leq UB$.




Figure 2: Illustration of the proof of Lemma 3 for $\Phi^{\text{incl}}(X, k)$ and $\Phi^{\text{excl}}(X, k)$. The dashed circles denote the layers. The pair of paths X and Y in G corresponds to the path π in G' .

(\Leftarrow) Assume that π is an s - t path in G' , feasible to CSP, with $\sum_{e \in \pi} c_e \leq UB$. For each arc $e^{(0)} = (i, j) \in \pi$, we add the arc $e = (i, j) \in A$ such that $C_e + \bar{c}_e = c_{e^{(0)}}$ to X and to Y . For each arc $e^{(1)} = (i, j) \in \pi$, we add the arcs corresponding to X_{ij}^* to X and the arcs corresponding to Y_{ij}^* to Y . It is easily seen that $X \in \Phi$, $Y \in \Phi^{\text{incl}}(X, k)$ and $UB \geq \sum_{e \in \pi} c_e = \sum_{e \in X} C_e + \sum_{e \in Y} \bar{c}_e$. \square

We get the following result:

Theorem 6. REC SP with the neighborhoods $\Phi^{\text{incl}}(X, k)$, $\Phi^{\text{excl}}(X, k)$ and $\Phi^{\text{sym}}(X, k)$ in a layered multidigraph $G = (V, A)$ can be solved in $O(|A||V| + |V|^2k)$ time.

Proof. The graph G' from the proof of Lemma 3 can be constructed in $O(|A||V|)$ time. The number of arcs in G' is $O(|V|^2)$, so the corresponding CSP problem can be solved in $O(|V|^2k)$ time, where $k \leq |A|$. Hence the overall running time is $O(|A||V| + |V|^2k)$. \square

3.2.2 General acyclic multidigraphs

If the input graph G is layered, then the disjoint subpaths of X and Y between any pair of nodes i and j have the same cardinalities. This fact has been exploited in Section 3.2.1. However, in general acyclic multidigraphs the paths from i to j can have different cardinalities, so cheaper recoverable action can require choosing more arcs. To overcome this problem, we will extend the construction of the graph G' shown in the proof of Lemma 3. However, the neighborhoods are not equivalent now, and we must consider them separately.

Lemma 4. There is a polynomial time reduction from the REC SP problem with the neighborhood $\Phi^{\text{incl}}(X, k)$ in an acyclic multidigraph $G = (V, A)$ to the CSP problem in an acyclic multidigraph with $T = k$.

Proof. Given an acyclic multidigraph $G = (V, A)$ and a recovery parameter k in an instance of REC SP, we construct an acyclic multidigraph $G' = (V', A')$ in the corresponding instance

of CSP. We set $V' = V$, $s' = s$, $t' = t$, and the set of arcs A' can contain $k + 1$ types of arcs labeled as $e^{(0)}, \dots, e^{(k)}$, respectively. For each pair of nodes $i, j \in V$, $i \neq j$, such that there exists at least one arc from i to j , we add to A' the arc $e^{(0)} = (i, j)$ with the cost $c_{e^{(0)}} = \min_{e=(k,l) \in A: k=i, l=j} \{C_e + \bar{c}_e\}$ and the transition time $t_{e^{(0)}} = 0$. Consider a pair of nodes $i, j \in V$, $i \neq j$, such that j is reachable from i . We first compute a path from i to j having the minimum number of arcs L_{ij}^* . If $L_{ij}^* > k$, then we do nothing. Otherwise, we find a shortest path X_{ij}^* from i to j with the costs C_e . Then, for each $l = L_{ij}^*, \dots, k$, we find a shortest path $Y_{ij}^{*(l)}$ with the costs \bar{c}_e , $e \in A$, subject to the condition that $Y_{ij}^{*(l)}$ has at most l arcs. Observe that $Y_{ij}^{*(l)}$ can be found in $O(|A|k)$ time by solving a CSP problem with arc transition times equal to 1 and the transition time limit equal to l . We add to A' the arc $e^{(l)} = (i, j)$ with the cost $c_{e^{(l)}} = \sum_{e \in X_{ij}^*} C_e + \sum_{e \in Y_{ij}^{*(l)}} \bar{c}_e$ and with the transition time $t_{e^{(l)}} = l$.

Finally, we set $T = k$. Graph G' can be constructed in $O(|V|^2|A|k^2)$ time since we have to solve at most k CSP problems for at most $|V|^2$ pairs of nodes. As in Lemma 3, we need to show that there is a pair of paths $X \in \Phi$ and $Y \in \Phi^{\text{incl}}(X, k)$ in G , feasible to REC SP, with the cost $\sum_{e \in X} C_e + \sum_{e \in Y} \bar{c}_e \leq UB$ if and only if there is a path π in G' , feasible to CSP, such that $\sum_{e \in \pi} c_e \leq UB$, where $UB \in \mathbb{R}$.

(\Rightarrow) The proof goes the same way as that of Lemma 3. Now, if $e = (i_{j-1}, i_j) \notin X \cap Y$, then there are two disjoint subpaths X' and Y' from i_{j-1} to i_j in G . The subpath Y' has $l \in \{L_{i_{j-1}i_j}^*, \dots, k\}$ arcs. We add to π the arc $e^{(l)} = (i_{j-1}, i_j) \in A'$. The transition time of $e^{(l)}$ is $|Y' \setminus X'| = l$ and its cost is at most $\sum_{e \in X'} C_e + \sum_{e \in Y'} \bar{c}_e$. The rest of the proof is the same as in Lemma 3 (an example is depicted in Figure 3).




Figure 3: Illustration of the proof of Lemma 4. The pair of paths X and Y for $\Phi^{\text{incl}}(X, k)$ in G corresponds to the path π in G' .

(\Leftarrow) Assume that π is an s - t path in G' feasible to CSP with $\sum_{e \in \pi} c_e \leq UB$. For each arc $e^{(0)} = (i, j) \in \pi$, we add the arc $e = (i, j) \in A$ such that $C_e + \bar{c}_e = c_{e^{(0)}}$ to X and to Y . For each arc $e^{(l)} = (i, j) \in \pi$, we add the arcs corresponding to X_{ij}^* to X and the arcs corresponding to $Y_{ij}^{*(l)}$ to Y . We recall that $|Y_{ij}^{*(l)}| \leq l$. It follows easily that $X \in \Phi$, $Y \in \Phi^{\text{incl}}(X, k)$ and $UB \geq \sum_{e \in \pi} c_e = \sum_{e \in X} C_e + \sum_{e \in Y} \bar{c}_e$. \square

Lemma 5. *There is a polynomial time reduction from the REC SP problem with the neighborhood $\Phi^{\text{excl}}(X, k)$ in an acyclic multidigraph $G = (V, A)$ to the CSP problem in an acyclic multidigraph with $T = k$.*

Proof. The reduction is similar to that in the proof of Lemma 4. We only point out some differences. Having computed $L_{ij}^* \leq k$, we find a shortest path Y_{ij}^* from i to j with the arc costs \bar{c}_e . Then, for each $l = L_{ij}^*, \dots, k$, we find a shortest path $X_{ij}^{*(l)}$ with the arc costs C_e , subject to the condition that $X_{ij}^{*(l)}$ has at most l arcs. We add to A' the arc $e^{(l)} = (i, j)$ with the cost $c_{e^{(l)}} = \sum_{e \in Y_{ij}^*} \bar{c}_e + \sum_{e \in X_{ij}^{*(l)}} C_e$ and with the transition time $t_{e^{(l)}} = l$. The proof goes then similarly to the proof of Lemma 4 with the following modifications:

(\Rightarrow) If $e = (i_{j-1}, i_j) \notin X \cap Y$, then the subpath X' from i_{j-1} to i_j in G has $l \in \{L_{i_{j-1}i_j}^*, \dots, k\}$ arcs. We add to π the arc $e^{(l)} = (i_{j-1}, i_j) \in A'$. The transition time of $e^{(l)}$ is $|X' \setminus Y'| = l$ and its cost is at most $\sum_{e \in X'} C_e + \sum_{e \in Y'} \bar{c}_e$.

(\Leftarrow) For each arc $e^{(l)} = (i, j) \in \pi$, we add the arcs corresponding to Y_{ij}^* to Y and the arcs corresponding to $X_{ij}^{*(l)}$ to X and we note that $|X_{ij}^{*(l)}| \leq l$. It follows then easily that $X \in \Phi$, $Y \in \Phi^{\text{excl}}(X, k)$ and $UB \geq \sum_{e \in \pi} c_e = \sum_{e \in X} C_e + \sum_{e \in Y} \bar{c}_e$. \square

Lemma 6. *There is a polynomial time reduction from the REC SP problem with the neighborhood $\Phi^{\text{sym}}(X, k)$ in an acyclic multidigraph $G = (V, A)$ to the CSP problem in an acyclic multidigraph with $T = k$.*

Proof. We again point out some differences in the reduction from Lemma 4. Having computed L_{ij}^* , if $2L_{ij}^* > k$, then we do nothing. Otherwise, for each $u = L_{ij}^*, \dots, k$ and $v = L_{ij}^*, \dots, k$, we find a shortest path $X_{ij}^{*(u)}$ with the costs C_e , $e \in A$, subject to the constraint $|X_{ij}^{*(u)}| \leq u$ and a shortest path $Y_{ij}^{*(v)}$ with the costs \bar{c}_e , $e \in A$, subject to the constraint $|Y_{ij}^{*(v)}| \leq v$. We add to A' the arc $e^{(uv)} = (i, j)$ with the cost $c_{e^{(uv)}} = \sum_{e \in X_{ij}^{*(u)}} C_e + \sum_{e \in Y_{ij}^{*(v)}} \bar{c}_e$ and the transition time $t_{e^{(uv)}} = u + v$. Graph G' can be constructed in $O(|V|^2|A|k^3)$ time because we have to solve at most k^2 CSP problems for at most $|V|^2$ pairs of nodes. The proof goes then similarly to the proof of Lemma 4 with the following modifications:

(\Rightarrow) If $e = (i_{j-1}, i_j) \notin X \cap Y$, then the subpaths X' and Y' from i_{j-1} to i_j in G have $u, v \in \{L_{i_{j-1}i_j}^*, \dots, k\}$ arcs, respectively. We add to π the arc $e^{(uv)} = (i_{j-1}, i_j) \in A'$. The transition time of $e^{(uv)}$ is $|(Y' \setminus X') \cup (X' \setminus Y')| = u + v$ and its cost is at most $\sum_{e \in X'} C_e + \sum_{e \in Y'} \bar{c}_e$.

(\Leftarrow) For each arc $e^{(uv)} = (i, j) \in \pi$, we add the arcs corresponding to $X_{ij}^{*(u)}$ to X and the arcs corresponding to $Y_{ij}^{*(v)}$ to Y , where $|X_{ij}^{*(u)}| \leq u$ and $|Y_{ij}^{*(v)}| \leq v$. Thus, $X \in \Phi$, $Y \in \Phi^{\text{sym}}(X, k)$ and $UB \geq \sum_{e \in \pi} c_e = \sum_{e \in X} C_e + \sum_{e \in Y} \bar{c}_e$. \square

Theorem 7. *REC SP in acyclic multidigraph $G = (V, A)$ can be solved in $O(|V|^2|A|k^2)$ time for the neighborhoods $\Phi^{\text{incl}}(X, k)$, $\Phi^{\text{excl}}(X, k)$ and in $O(|V|^2|A|k^3)$ time for the neighborhood $\Phi^{\text{sym}}(X, k)$.*

Proof. The multidigraphs G' from Lemma 4 and Lemma 5 can be constructed in $O(|V|^2|A|k^2)$ time and have at most $|V|^2(k+1)$ arcs. The CSP problem in G' can then be solved in $O(|V|^2k^2)$ time. The overall running time for $\Phi^{\text{incl}}(X, k)$ and $\Phi^{\text{excl}}(X, k)$ is $O(|V|^2|A|k^2)$. Accordingly, the multidigraph G' from Lemma 6 can be constructed in $O(|V|^2|A|k^3)$ time and has at most $|V|^2(k^2+1)$ arcs. The CSP problem in G' can then be solved in $O(|V|^2k^3)$ time. Hence, the overall running time for $\Phi^{\text{sym}}(X, k)$ is $O(|V|^2|A|k^3)$. \square

3.2.3 Arc series-parallel multidigraph

In this section, we will construct algorithms with better running time for REC SP with all the considered neighborhoods, assuming that G is an arc series-parallel multidigraph. Again, we have to treat all the considered neighborhoods separately, as the subpaths between two nodes of G may have different cardinalities. Let us recall that an arc series-parallel multidigraph (ASP) is recursively defined as follows (see, e.g., [35]). A graph consisting of two nodes joined by a single arc is ASP. If G_1 and G_2 are ASP, so are the multidigraphs constructed by each of the following two operations:

- *parallel composition* $p(G_1, G_2)$: identify the source of G_1 with the source of G_2 and the sink of G_1 with the sink of G_2 ,
- *series composition* $s(G_1, G_2)$: identify the sink of G_1 with the source of G_2 .

Each ASP multidigraph G is associated with a rooted binary tree \mathcal{T} , called *the binary decomposition tree of G* , which can be constructed in $O(|A|)$ time [35]. Each leaf of the tree represents an arc in G . Each internal node σ of \mathcal{T} is labeled by S or P and corresponds to the series or parallel composition in G . Every node σ of \mathcal{T} corresponds to an ASP subgraph of G , denoted by G_σ , defined by the subtree rooted at σ . The root of \mathcal{T} represents the input ASP multidigraph G .

In [8], Büsing showed an idea of a polynomial-time algorithm for REC SP with $\Phi^{\text{incl}}(X, k)$ in ASP multidigraphs, together with a theorem resulting from it [8, Theorem 5]. In this section, we will describe a complete $O(|A|k^2)$ -time algorithm for REC SP in ASP multidigraphs with the neighborhoods $\Phi^{\text{incl}}(X, k)$, $\Phi^{\text{excl}}(X, k)$ and $\Phi^{\text{sym}}(X, k)$. Let Φ_{G_σ} denote the set of all paths from the source to the sink in G_σ and

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_{G_\sigma}^l &= \{X \in \Phi_{G_\sigma} : |X| = l\}, \\ \Psi_{G_\sigma}^{\text{incl}[l]} &= \{(X, Y) \in \Phi_{G_\sigma} \times \Phi_{G_\sigma} : |Y \setminus X| = l\}, \\ \Psi_{G_\sigma}^{\text{excl}[l]} &= \{(X, Y) \in \Phi_{G_\sigma} \times \Phi_{G_\sigma} : |X \setminus Y| = l\}, \\ \Psi_{G_\sigma}^{\text{sym}[l]} &= \{(X, Y) \in \Phi_{G_\sigma} \times \Phi_{G_\sigma} : |Y \setminus X| + |X \setminus Y| = l\}.\end{aligned}$$

Consider first the arc inclusion neighborhood $\Phi^{\text{incl}}(X, k)$. For each ASP subgraph G_σ , we store the following three crucial pieces of information. The first one is the cost of a shortest path from the source to the sink in G_σ under costs C_e , $e \in A$:

$$C_{G_\sigma} = \min_{X \in \Phi_{G_\sigma}} \sum_{e \in X} C_e. \quad (26)$$

The second one is the k -element array $\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_\sigma}$, whose l -th element $\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_\sigma}[l]$ is the cost of a shortest path $Y^* \in \Phi_{G_\sigma}^l$ under the costs \bar{c}_e , $e \in A$, if such a path exists:

$$\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_\sigma}[l] = \begin{cases} \min_{Y \in \Phi_{G_\sigma}^l} \sum_{e \in Y} \bar{c}_e & \text{if } \Phi_{G_\sigma}^l \neq \emptyset, \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad l = 1, \dots, k. \quad (27)$$

The third one is the $(k + 1)$ -element array $\mathbf{c}_{G_\sigma}^*$, whose l -th element $\mathbf{c}_{G_\sigma}^*[l]$, stores the cost of

an optimal pair $(X^*, Y^*) \in \Psi_{G_\sigma}^{\text{incl}[l]}$, if such paths exist:

$$\mathbf{c}_{G_\sigma}^*[l] = \begin{cases} \min_{(X,Y) \in \Psi_{G_\sigma}^{\text{incl}[l]}} \left(\sum_{e \in X} C_e + \sum_{e \in Y} \bar{c}_e \right) & \text{if } \Psi_{G_\sigma}^{\text{incl}[l]} \neq \emptyset, \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad l = 0, \dots, k. \quad (28)$$

Note that at least one set of paths $\Psi_{G_\sigma}^{\text{incl}[l]}$ is always nonempty in G_σ , for instance, when $l = 0$. For each leaf node σ of the tree \mathcal{T} (in this case, the subgraph G_σ consists of a single arc $e \in A$), the initial values of C_{G_σ} , $\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_\sigma}$ and $\mathbf{c}_{G_\sigma}^*$ are as follows:

$$C_{G_\sigma} = C_e, \quad (29)$$

$$\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_\sigma}[1] = \bar{c}_e, \quad \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_\sigma}[l] = +\infty, \quad l = 2, \dots, k, \quad (30)$$

$$\mathbf{c}_{G_\sigma}^*[0] = C_e + \bar{c}_e, \quad \mathbf{c}_{G_\sigma}^*[l] = +\infty, \quad l = 1, \dots, k. \quad (31)$$

By traversing the tree \mathcal{T} from the leaves to the root, we recursively construct each ASP subgraph G_σ corresponding to the internal node σ and compute the values of C_{G_σ} , $\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_\sigma}$ and $\mathbf{c}_{G_\sigma}^*$ associated with G_σ , depending on the label of the node σ . If σ is marked P, then we call Algorithm 1, otherwise we call Algorithm 2 on the subgraphs $G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}$ and $G_{\text{right}(\sigma)}$, where $\text{left}(\sigma)$ and $\text{right}(\sigma)$ are children of σ in \mathcal{T} . If σ is the root of \mathcal{T} , then $G_\sigma = G$ and the array $\mathbf{c}_{G_\sigma}^*$ contains information about the cost of an optimal pair of paths $X^*, Y^* \in \Phi$, being an optimal solution to REC SP in G , which is equal to

$$\min_{0 \leq l \leq k} \mathbf{c}_{G_\sigma}^*[l].$$

The algorithm for REC SP with $\Phi^{\text{incl}}(X, k)$ is given in the form of Algorithm 3. For simplicity of the presentation, we have only shown how to compute the costs stored in C_{G_σ} , $\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_\sigma}$ and $\mathbf{c}_{G_\sigma}^*$. The associated paths can be easily reconstructed by using pointers to the first and the last arcs of these paths, managed during the course of the algorithm.

Algorithm 1: P-incl($G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}, \mathbf{c}_{G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}}^*, C_{G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}}, G_{\text{right}(\sigma)}, \mathbf{c}_{G_{\text{right}(\sigma)}}^*, C_{G_{\text{right}(\sigma)}}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_{\text{right}(\sigma)}}$)

- 1 Perform parallel composition $G_\sigma \leftarrow p(G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}, G_{\text{right}(\sigma)})$;
 - 2 $C_{G_\sigma} \leftarrow \min\{C_{G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}}, C_{G_{\text{right}(\sigma)}}\}$;
 - 3 $\mathbf{c}_{G_\sigma}^*[0] \leftarrow \min\{\mathbf{c}_{G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}}^*[0], \mathbf{c}_{G_{\text{right}(\sigma)}}^*[0]\}$;
 - 4 **for** $l = 1$ **to** k **do**
 - 5 $\mathbf{c}_{G_\sigma}^*[l] \leftarrow \min\{\mathbf{c}_{G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}}^*[l], \mathbf{c}_{G_{\text{right}(\sigma)}}^*[l], C_{G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}} + \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_{\text{right}(\sigma)}}[l], C_{G_{\text{right}(\sigma)}} + \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}}[l]\}$;
 - 6 $\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_\sigma}[l] \leftarrow \min\{\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}}[l], \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_{\text{right}(\sigma)}}[l]\}$
 - 7 **return** ($G_\sigma, \mathbf{c}_{G_\sigma}^*, C_{G_\sigma}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_\sigma}$)
-

An algorithm for REC SP with $\Phi^{\text{excl}}(X, k)$ is symmetric to the one with $\Phi^{\text{incl}}(X, k)$. We also store three pieces of information for each ASP subgraph G_σ . Namely, the cost of a shortest path from the source to the sink in G_σ under costs \bar{c}_e , $e \in A$:

$$\bar{c}_{G_\sigma} = \min_{Y \in \Phi_{G_\sigma}} \sum_{e \in Y} \bar{c}_e. \quad (32)$$

Algorithm 2: $\text{S-incl}(G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}, \mathbf{c}_{G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}}^*, C_{G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}}, G_{\text{right}(\sigma)}, \mathbf{c}_{G_{\text{right}(\sigma)}}^*, C_{G_{\text{right}(\sigma)}}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_{\text{right}(\sigma)}})$

```

1 Perform series composition  $G_\sigma \leftarrow s(G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}, G_{\text{right}(\sigma)});$ 
2  $C_{G_\sigma} \leftarrow C_{G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}} + C_{G_{\text{right}(\sigma)}};$ 
3 for  $l = 0$  to  $k$  do
4    $\mathbf{c}_{G_\sigma}^*[l] \leftarrow \min_{0 \leq j \leq l} \{ \mathbf{c}_{G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}}^*[j] + \mathbf{c}_{G_{\text{right}(\sigma)}}^*[l-j] \}$ 
5    $\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_\sigma}[1] \leftarrow +\infty;$ 
6   for  $l = 2$  to  $k$  do
7      $\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_\sigma}[l] \leftarrow \min_{1 \leq j < l} \{ \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}}[j] + \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_{\text{right}(\sigma)}}[l-j] \}$ 
8 return  $(G_\sigma, \mathbf{c}_{G_\sigma}^*, C_{G_\sigma}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_\sigma})$ 

```

Algorithm 3: Solve REC SP in $\text{ASP}(G, \{C_e\}_{e \in A}, \{\bar{c}_e\}_{e \in A}, k, s, t)$ with $\Phi^{\text{incl}}(X, k)$

```

1 Find the binary decomposition tree  $\mathcal{T}$  of  $G$ ;
2 foreach leaf  $\sigma$  of  $\mathcal{T}$  do // Initially  $\sigma$  corresponds to arc  $e \in A$ 
3    $\mathbf{c}_{G_\sigma}^*[0] \leftarrow C_e + \bar{c}_e;$ 
4   for  $l = 1$  to  $k$  do  $\mathbf{c}_{G_\sigma}^*[l] \leftarrow +\infty;$ 
5    $C_{G_\sigma} \leftarrow C_e;$ 
6    $\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_\sigma}[1] \leftarrow \bar{c}_e;$ 
7   for  $l = 2$  to  $k$  do  $\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_\sigma}[l] \leftarrow +\infty;$ 
8 while there is a node  $\sigma$  in  $\mathcal{T}$  with two leaves:  $\text{left}(\sigma)$  and  $\text{right}(\sigma)$  do
9   if node  $\sigma$  is labeled P in  $\mathcal{T}$  then
10      $(G_\sigma, \mathbf{c}_{G_\sigma}^*, C_{G_\sigma}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_\sigma}) \leftarrow$ 
        $\text{P-incl}(G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}, \mathbf{c}_{G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}}^*, C_{G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}}, G_{\text{right}(\sigma)}, \mathbf{c}_{G_{\text{right}(\sigma)}}^*, C_{G_{\text{right}(\sigma)}}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_{\text{right}(\sigma)}})$ 
11   else // node  $\sigma$  is labeled S in  $\mathcal{T}$ 
12      $(G_\sigma, \mathbf{c}_{G_\sigma}^*, C_{G_\sigma}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_\sigma}) \leftarrow$ 
        $\text{S-incl}(G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}, \mathbf{c}_{G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}}^*, C_{G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}}, G_{\text{right}(\sigma)}, \mathbf{c}_{G_{\text{right}(\sigma)}}^*, C_{G_{\text{right}(\sigma)}}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_{\text{right}(\sigma)}})$ 
13   Delete leaves  $\text{left}(\sigma)$  and  $\text{right}(\sigma)$  from  $\mathcal{T}$ ;
14 return  $\min_{0 \leq l \leq k} \mathbf{c}_{G_\sigma}^*[l]$  // node  $\sigma$  is the root of  $\mathcal{T}$  corresponding to  $G$ 

```

The k -element array \mathbf{C}_{G_σ} , whose l -th element $\mathbf{C}_{G_\sigma}[l]$ is the cost of a shortest path from the source to the sink in G_σ under costs C_e , $e \in A$, that uses exactly l arcs if such a path exists:

$$\mathbf{C}_{G_\sigma}[l] = \begin{cases} \min_{X \in \Phi_{G_\sigma}^l} \sum_{e \in X} C_e & \text{if } \Phi_{G_\sigma}^l \neq \emptyset, \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad l = 1, \dots, k. \quad (33)$$

The third element is the $(k+1)$ -element array $\mathbf{c}_{G_\sigma}^*$ whose definition is the same as (28) with the exception that $\Psi_{G_\sigma}^{\text{incl}[l]}$ is replaced with $\Psi_{G_\sigma}^{\text{excl}[l]}$. The initial values of \bar{c}_{G_σ} , \mathbf{C}_{G_σ} and $\mathbf{c}_{G_\sigma}^*$ for each leaf node σ of the tree \mathcal{T} are as follows:

$$\bar{c}_{G_\sigma} = \bar{c}_e, \quad (34)$$

$$\mathbf{C}_{G_\sigma}[1] = C_e, \quad \mathbf{C}_{G_\sigma}[l] = +\infty, \quad l = 2, \dots, k, \quad (35)$$

$$\mathbf{c}_{G_\sigma}^*[0] = C_e + \bar{c}_e, \quad \mathbf{c}_{G_\sigma}^*[l] = +\infty, \quad l = 1, \dots, k. \quad (36)$$

It is easily seen that adapting Algorithms 1 and 2 and, in consequence, Algorithm 3 for the neighborhood $\Phi^{\text{excl}}(X, k)$ requires small changes in them that take into account \bar{c}_{G_σ} , \mathbf{C}_{G_σ} , $\mathbf{c}_{G_\sigma}^*$, and (34)–(36).

An algorithm for REC SP with the symmetric difference neighborhood $\Phi^{\text{sym}}(X, k)$ combines the ideas for the neighborhoods $\Phi^{\text{incl}}(X, k)$ and $\Phi^{\text{excl}}(X, k)$. The three arrays are now associated with each ASP subgraph G_σ . Namely, the $(k-1)$ -element arrays $\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_\sigma}$, and \mathbf{C}_{G_σ} defined as (27) and (33), respectively, for $l \in [k-1]$. The $(k+1)$ -element array $\mathbf{c}_{G_\sigma}^*$, whose definition is the same as (28), with the exception that $\Psi_{G_\sigma}^{\text{incl}[l]}$ is replaced with $\Psi_{G_\sigma}^{\text{sym}[l]}$. Of course, $\mathbf{c}_{G_\sigma}^*[1] = +\infty$. The initial values of $\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_\sigma}$, \mathbf{C}_{G_σ} , and $\mathbf{c}_{G_\sigma}^*$, for each leaf node σ of the tree \mathcal{T} , are as follows:

$$\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_\sigma}[1] = \bar{c}_e, \quad \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_\sigma}[l] = +\infty, \quad l = 2, \dots, k-1, \quad (37)$$

$$\mathbf{C}_{G_\sigma}[1] = C_e, \quad \mathbf{C}_{G_\sigma}[l] = +\infty, \quad l = 2, \dots, k-1, \quad (38)$$

$$\mathbf{c}_{G_\sigma}^*[0] = C_e + \bar{c}_e, \quad \mathbf{c}_{G_\sigma}^*[l] = +\infty, \quad l = 1, \dots, k. \quad (39)$$

Algorithm 4: P-sym($G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}$, $\mathbf{c}_{G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}}^*$, $\mathbf{C}_{G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}}$, $\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}}$, $G_{\text{right}(\sigma)}$, $\mathbf{c}_{G_{\text{right}(\sigma)}}^*$, $\mathbf{C}_{G_{\text{right}(\sigma)}}$, $\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_{\text{right}(\sigma)}}$)

- 1 Perform parallel composition $G_\sigma \leftarrow p(G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}, G_{\text{right}(\sigma)})$;
 - 2 $\mathbf{c}_{G_\sigma}^*[0] \leftarrow \min\{\mathbf{c}_{G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}}^*[0], \mathbf{c}_{G_{\text{right}(\sigma)}}^*[0]\}$;
 - 3 $\mathbf{c}_{G_\sigma}^*[1] \leftarrow +\infty$;
 - 4 **for** $l = 2$ **to** k **do**
 - 5 $\mathbf{c}_{G_\sigma}^*[l] \leftarrow$
 $\min_{1 \leq j < l} \{\mathbf{c}_{G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}}^*[l], \mathbf{c}_{G_{\text{right}(\sigma)}}^*[l], \mathbf{C}_{G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}}[j] + \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_{\text{right}(\sigma)}}[l-j], \mathbf{C}_{G_{\text{right}(\sigma)}}[j] + \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}}[l-j]\}$;
 - 6 **for** $l = 1$ **to** $k-1$ **do**
 - 7 $\mathbf{C}_{G_\sigma}[l] \leftarrow \min\{\mathbf{C}_{G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}}[l], \mathbf{C}_{G_{\text{right}(\sigma)}}[l]\}$;
 - 8 $\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_\sigma}[l] \leftarrow \min\{\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}}[l], \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_{\text{right}(\sigma)}}[l]\}$
 - 9 **return** ($G_\sigma, \mathbf{c}_{G_\sigma}^*, \mathbf{C}_{G_\sigma}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_\sigma}$)
-

In order to give a version of Algorithm 3 for the neighborhood $\Phi^{\text{sym}}(X, k)$, we need to modify the initialization according to (37)–(39 (lines 2–7) and call Algorithms 4 and 5 in the lines 10 and 12, respectively.

We now prove the correctness of the algorithms.

Algorithm 5: $\mathbf{S}\text{-sym}(G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}, \mathbf{c}_{G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}}^*, \mathbf{C}_{G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}}, G_{\text{right}(\sigma)}, \mathbf{c}_{G_{\text{right}(\sigma)}}^*, \mathbf{C}_{G_{\text{right}(\sigma)}}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_{\text{right}(\sigma)}})$

```

1 Perform series composition  $G_\sigma \leftarrow s(G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}, G_{\text{right}(\sigma)})$ ;
2 for  $l = 0$  to  $k$  do
3    $\mathbf{c}_{G_\sigma}^*[l] \leftarrow \min_{0 \leq j \leq l} \{ \mathbf{c}_{G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}}^*[j] + \mathbf{c}_{G_{\text{right}(\sigma)}}^*[l-j] \}$ 
4    $\mathbf{C}_{G_\sigma}[1] \leftarrow +\infty$ ;
5    $\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_\sigma}[1] \leftarrow +\infty$ ;
6   for  $l = 2$  to  $k-1$  do
7      $\mathbf{C}_{G_\sigma}[l] \leftarrow \min_{1 \leq j < l} \{ \mathbf{C}_{G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}}[j] + \mathbf{C}_{G_{\text{right}(\sigma)}}[l-j] \}$ ;
8      $\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_\sigma}[l] \leftarrow \min_{1 \leq j < l} \{ \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}}[j] + \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_{\text{right}(\sigma)}}[l-j] \}$ 
9 return  $(G_\sigma, \mathbf{c}_{G_\sigma}^*, \mathbf{C}_{G_\sigma}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_\sigma})$ 

```

Theorem 8. REC SP with $\Phi^{\text{incl}}(X, k)$, $\Phi^{\text{excl}}(X, k)$ and $\Phi^{\text{sym}}(X, k)$ in arc series-parallel multidigraphs $G = (V, A)$ can be solved in $O(|A|k^2)$ time.

Proof. We will give a proof only for the arc inclusion neighborhood $\Phi^{\text{incl}}(X, k)$. The proof for the neighborhood $\Phi^{\text{excl}}(X, k)$ is almost the same, while a proof for $\Phi^{\text{sym}}(X, k)$ is similar in spirit to the proof given below. It is enough to make some technical changes to take into account the differences among the neighborhoods described previously in this section.

We first prove that for each node σ of the decomposition tree \mathcal{T} , graph G_σ is an ASP subgraph of G and the corresponding costs C_{G_σ} , $\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_\sigma}$ and $\mathbf{c}_{G_\sigma}^*$ are correctly computed by Algorithm 3. The first part of the claim is due to [35]. It is easily seen that after running lines 3–7, for each leaf σ of \mathcal{T} , the costs C_{G_σ} , $\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_\sigma}$ and $\mathbf{c}_{G_\sigma}^*$, corresponding to the single-arc subgraphs, are correctly initialized. Hence, if $|A| = 1$, then the claim trivially holds. Assume that $|A| \geq 2$. The proof is by induction on the number of iterations of Algorithm 3 (the lines 9–13).

The base case is when the algorithm runs for only one iteration ($|A| = 2$). The node σ is then the root of \mathcal{T} and has two leaves corresponding to two single-arc subgraphs $G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}$ and $G_{\text{right}(\sigma)}$. If σ is labeled P, then the algorithm P-incl is called for $G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}$ and $G_{\text{right}(\sigma)}$, otherwise the S-incl is called. Consider the P-incl case. First the parallel composition of $G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}$ and $G_{\text{right}(\sigma)}$ is performed. The resulting graph G_σ has two parallel arcs, e_1, e_2 , the source and the sink. We get $\mathbf{c}_{G_\sigma}^*[0] = \min\{C_{e_1} + \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{e_1}, C_{e_2} + \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{e_2}\}$, $\mathbf{c}_{G_\sigma}^*[1] = \min\{+\infty, +\infty, C_{e_1} + \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{e_2}, C_{e_2} + \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{e_1}\}$, $\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_\sigma}[1] = \min\{\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{e_1}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{e_2}\}$ and $C_{G_\sigma} = \min\{C_{e_1}, C_{e_2}\}$. The rest of elements of $\mathbf{c}_{G_\sigma}^*$ and $\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_\sigma}$ are equal to $+\infty$. Let us turn to the case S-incl. Now, after the series composition of $G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}$ and $G_{\text{right}(\sigma)}$, the resulting graph G_σ has three nodes $\{s, v_1, t\}$ and two series arcs $e_1 = (s, v_1)$, $e_2 = (v_1, t)$. Therefore, only one s - t path exists in G_σ . We get $\mathbf{c}_{G_\sigma}^*[0] = C_{e_1} + \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{e_1} + C_{e_2} + \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{e_2}$, $C_{G_\sigma} = C_{e_1} + C_{e_2}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_\sigma}[2] = \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{e_1} + \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{e_2}$. The rest of the elements of $\mathbf{c}_{G_\sigma}^*$ and $\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_\sigma}$ are equal to $+\infty$. Hence all the costs C_{G_σ} , $\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_\sigma}$ and $\mathbf{c}_{G_\sigma}^*$ are correctly computed for the base case.

For the induction step, let σ be an internal node of \mathcal{T} with two leaves $\text{left}(\sigma)$ and $\text{right}(\sigma)$. By the induction hypothesis, $G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}$ and $G_{\text{right}(\sigma)}$ are ASP subgraphs and the costs C_{G_σ} , $\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_\sigma}$ and $\mathbf{c}_{G_\sigma}^*$, associated with them, are correctly computed. We need to consider two cases that depend on the label of σ . The first case (the label P) is when the algorithm P-incl is called for $G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}$ and $G_{\text{right}(\sigma)}$. After the parallel composition of $G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}$ and $G_{\text{right}(\sigma)}$, the resulting subgraph G_σ is an ASP subgraph. Note that, $\Phi_{G_\sigma} = \Phi_{\text{left}(\sigma)} \cup \Phi_{G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}}$, where $\Phi_{G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}} \cap \Phi_{\text{left}(\sigma)} = \emptyset$. Hence, we immediately get that the costs computed in lines 2, 3, and 6 of Algorithm 1 are correctly computed. The costs $\mathbf{c}_{G_\sigma}^*[l]$, for $l = 1, \dots, k$, (see line 6 of

Algorithm 1), are correctly computed as well. Indeed, the first two terms in the minimum are obvious. The last two terms take into account the cases when the optimal paths $X^* \in \Phi_{G_\sigma}$ and $Y^* \in \Phi_{G_\sigma}$ in $\Psi_{G_\sigma}^{\text{incl}[l]}$ are such that $X^* \in \Phi_{G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}}$ and $Y^* \in \Phi_{G_{\text{right}(\sigma)}}$ or $X^* \in \Phi_{G_{\text{right}(\sigma)}}$ and $Y^* \in \Phi_{G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}}$. Consider the second case (the label **S**) when the algorithm **S-incl** is called. The subgraph G_σ , after the series composition of $G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}$ and $G_{\text{right}(\sigma)}$, is an ASP subgraph and there is a node v in G_σ being the sink of $G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}$ and the source of $G_{\text{right}(\sigma)}$. Thus, every path $X \in \Phi_{G_\sigma}$ must traverse the node v and X is the concatenation of $X_1 \in \Phi_{G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}}$ and $X_2 \in \Phi_{G_{\text{right}(\sigma)}}$. In what follows, for each $l = 0, \dots, k$, the cost $\mathbf{c}_{G_\sigma}^*[l]$ in G_σ is the sum of its optimal counterparts, respectively, in $G_{\text{left}(\sigma)}$ and $G_{\text{right}(\sigma)}$, for some $0 \leq j^* \leq l$. It is enough to find such j^* for each l . A similar argument holds for the costs $\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_\sigma}[l]$ for $l = 2, \dots, k$. Therefore, Algorithm 2 correctly computes the costs C_{G_σ} , $\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{G_\sigma}$ and $\mathbf{c}_{G_\sigma}^*$ in lines 2, 4 and 7. This proves the claim.

If σ is the root of \mathcal{T} , then $G_\sigma = G$. It immediately follows from the claim, that the array $\mathbf{c}_{G_\sigma}^*$ contains the optimal costs of the solutions in $\Psi_{G_\sigma}^{\text{incl}[l]}$ for $l = 0, \dots, k$. Thus, the cost of an optimal solution, $X^*, Y^* \in \Phi$ to REC SP in G is equal to $\min_{0 \leq l \leq k} \mathbf{c}_{G_\sigma}^*[l]$.

Let us analyze the running time of Algorithm 3. The binary decomposition tree \mathcal{T} of G , line 1, can be constructed in $O(|A|)$ time [35]. The initialization, lines 2–7, can be done in $O(|A|)$ time. The root of \mathcal{T} can be reached in $O(|A|)$ time, lines 8–13. Algorithms 1 and 2 require $O(k^2)$ time. Hence, the running time of Algorithm 3 is $O(|A|k^2)$. Since the algorithm for $\Phi^{\text{excl}}(X, k)$ is symmetric, its running time is the same. Observe that Algorithms 4 and 5 require $O(k^2)$ time. Thus, the running time of algorithm for $\Phi^{\text{sym}}(X, k)$ is $O(|A|k^2)$. \square

4 The Rec Rob SP problem under the budgeted uncertainty

In this section, we consider the REC ROB SP problem under the budgeted uncertainty. Adding budgets to the interval uncertainty representation makes the problem more challenging. Of course, all the hardness results for REC SP (see Section 3.1) remain valid for REC ROB SP with the budgeted uncertainty. In particular, the problem is strongly NP-hard and not approximable in general digraphs for all the neighborhoods under consideration. Table 2 summarizes the main results obtained later in this section.

Table 2: Summary of the main results for REC ROB SP under the budgeted uncertainty for various neighborhoods.

| Budgeted uncertainty | Neighborhoods | | |
|-------------------------|--|---------------------------------|---------------------------|
| | $\Phi^{\text{incl}}(X, k)$ | $\Phi^{\text{excl}}(X, k)$ | $\Phi^{\text{sym}}(X, k)$ |
| $\mathcal{U}(\Gamma^c)$ | MIP | MIP | MIP |
| | para-NP-complete | | |
| $\mathcal{U}(\Gamma^d)$ | MIP(?) - open problem | Σ_3^P -hard [25] | Σ_3^P -hard [25] |
| | strongly NP-hard | Σ_3^P -hard | Σ_3^P -hard |
| | not approximable for $k = \Gamma^d = 1$ [33] | to approximate for $k = 2$ [25] | to approximate [25] |

4.1 The Rec Rob SP problem under $\mathcal{U}(\Gamma^c)$

We now show a compact MIP formulation for REC ROB SP under the scenario set $\mathcal{U}(\Gamma^c)$. We will use the fact that $\mathcal{U}(\Gamma^c)$ is a special case of polyhedral uncertainty.

Theorem 9. *The REC ROB SP under $\mathcal{U}(\Gamma^c)$ in general digraph $G = (V, A)$, $|A| = m$, with neighborhoods $\Phi^{\text{incl}}(X, k)$, $\Phi^{\text{excl}}(X, k)$ and $\Phi^{\text{sym}}(X, k)$, admits a compact MIP formulation.*

Proof. The idea of the construction is similar to that in [5, Theorem 1] (see also [19]), where a compact MIP formulation for a recoverable version of a single-machine scheduling problem under uncertainty was proposed. It uses Carathéodory's theorem, which states that any point in a convex hull $\text{Conv}(P)$ of a set $P \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ can be expressed as a convex combination of at most $n + 1$ points in P . Then, using the minimax theorem (see, e.g., [5] for details) allows us to express REC ROB SP as follows:

$$\min_{\substack{X \in \Phi \\ Y^{(1)}, \dots, Y^{(m+1)} \in \Phi(X, k)}} \left(\sum_{e \in X} C_e + \max_{S \in \mathcal{U}(\Gamma^c)} \min_{i \in [m+1]} \sum_{e \in Y^{(i)}} c_e^S \right). \quad (40)$$

Fix $\mathbf{x} \in \chi(\Phi)$ and $\mathbf{y}^{(i)} \in \chi(\Phi(\mathbf{x}, k))$, $i \in [m + 1]$ (see Section 3.1.2 for the description of the sets $\chi(\Phi)$ and $\chi(\Phi(\mathbf{x}, k))$). The inner problem

$$\max_{S \in \mathcal{U}(\Gamma^c)} \min_{i \in [m+1]} \sum_{e \in Y^{(i)}} c_e^S \quad (41)$$

can be modeled as follows:

$$\max t \quad (42)$$

$$t \leq \sum_{e \in A} \hat{c}_e y_e^{(i)} + \sum_{e \in A} y_e^{(i)} u_e \quad \forall i \in [m + 1], \quad (43)$$

$$0 \leq u_e \leq \Delta_e \quad \forall e \in A, \quad (44)$$

$$\sum_{e \in A} u_e \leq \Gamma^c. \quad (45)$$

Dualizing the inner problem, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \sum_{i \in [m+1]} \left(\sum_{e \in A} \hat{c}_e y_e^{(i)} \right) \lambda_i + \sum_{e \in A} \Delta_e \gamma_e + \Gamma^c \Theta \\ & \sum_{i \in [m+1]} \lambda_i = 1, \\ \gamma_e + \Theta \geq \quad & \sum_{i \in [m+1]} y_e^{(i)} \lambda_i \quad \forall e \in A, \\ \lambda_i \geq 0 \quad & \forall i \in [m + 1], \\ \gamma_e \geq 0 \quad & \forall e \in A, \\ \Theta \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

By the strong duality, REC ROB SP under $\mathcal{U}(\Gamma^c)$ can be rewritten as

$$\min \sum_{e \in A} C_e x_e + \sum_{e \in A} \hat{c}_e \sum_{i \in [m+1]} y_e^{(i)} \lambda_i + \sum_{e \in A} \Delta_e \gamma_e + \Gamma^c \Theta \quad (46)$$

$$\sum_{i \in [m+1]} \lambda_i = 1, \quad (47)$$

$$\gamma_e + \Theta \geq \sum_{i \in [m+1]} y_e^{(i)} \lambda_i \quad \forall e \in A, \quad (48)$$

$$\lambda_i \geq 0 \quad \forall i \in [m+1], \quad (49)$$

$$\gamma_e \geq 0 \quad \forall e \in A, \quad (50)$$

$$\Theta \geq 0, \quad (51)$$

$$\mathbf{y}^{(i)} \in \chi(\Phi(\mathbf{x}, k)) \quad \forall i \in [m+1], \quad (52)$$

$$\mathbf{x} \in \chi(\Phi). \quad (53)$$

The constraint (53) can be replaced with (14)–(18). The constraints (52) can be replaced with one of (19)–(21), depending on the neighborhood used (see Section 3.1.2). Finally, it suffices to linearize the terms $y_e^{(i)} \lambda_i$ that appear in (48). This can be done by substituting $v_i = y_e^{(i)} \lambda_i$, $i \in [m+1]$, and adding the constraints $v_i \leq M y_e^{(i)}$, $v_i \geq \lambda_i - M(1 - y_e^{(i)})$, $v_i \leq \lambda_i$, $v_i \geq 0$. \square

The following theorem establishes the parameterized complexity hardness of REC ROB SP, not only when parameterized by k (see Theorem 2), but also by Γ^c .

Theorem 10. *The decision version of REC ROB SP under $\mathcal{U}(\Gamma^c)$ with $\Phi^{\text{incl}}(X, k)$ parameterized by k and Γ^c is para-NP-complete in general digraphs.*

Proof. The problem REC ROB SP is in NP, since (40) shows that $X \in \Phi$ and $Y^{(1)}, \dots, Y^{(m+1)} \in \Phi^{\text{incl}}(X, k)$ is a certificate for proving if an instance of REC ROB SP is a Yes-instance and computing the value of $\sum_{e \in X} C_e + \max_{S \in \mathcal{U}(\Gamma^c)} \min_{i \in [m+1]} \sum_{e \in Y^{(i)}} c_e^S$ can be done in polynomial time by solving the linear programming model (42)–(45). Thus, REC ROB SP is in para-NP. Since REC ROB SP is NP-hard for constant k and Γ^c ($k = \Gamma^c = 1$) [33], it is para-NP-hard. \square

Theorem 10 shows that REC ROB SP under $\mathcal{U}(\Gamma^c)$ with $\Phi^{\text{incl}}(X, k)$ parameterized by k and Γ^c is para-NP-hard in general digraphs.

4.2 The Rec Rob SP problem under $\mathcal{U}(\Gamma^d)$

It has been recently proven in [25] that REC ROB SP with scenario set $\mathcal{U}(\Gamma^d)$ and neighborhoods $\Phi^{\text{excl}}(X, k)$, $\Phi^{\text{sym}}(X, k)$ is Σ_3^p -hard and Σ_3^p -hard to approximate in general digraphs. This excludes a compact MIP formulation for the problem unless the polynomial-time hierarchy collapses (see, e.g., [36]). Construction of a compact MIP formulation for the neighborhood $\Phi^{\text{incl}}(X, k)$, or for acyclic digraphs, is an interesting open problem.

It was shown in [33] that REC ROB SP with $\Phi^{\text{incl}}(X, k)$ under $\mathcal{U}(\Gamma^d)$ is strongly NP-hard and not approximable in general digraphs, even if the recovery parameter $k = 1$ and the budget $\Gamma^d = 1$, by a reduction from K -V-DP, where the number of terminal pairs $K = 2$,

for a general digraph [16]. Since K -V-DP remains strongly NP-complete in an acyclic planar digraph if K is unbounded [34], we can easily obtain a reduction from K -V-DP in an acyclic planar digraph, which is a minor generalization of the one given in [33]. This allows us to show that REC ROB SP under $\mathcal{U}(\Gamma^d)$ with $\Phi^{\text{incl}}(X, k)$ is strongly NP-hard and not approximable if $k = \Gamma^d = 1$ in digraphs with a simpler structure than general digraphs, namely, nearly acyclic planar ones. From the above, we immediately get that REC ROB SP under $\mathcal{U}(\Gamma^d)$ with $\Phi^{\text{incl}}(X, k)$ is para-NP-hard in these simpler digraphs.

4.3 Approximation algorithms

In this section, we again study the REC ROB SP problem in acyclic multidigraphs. We have shown in Section 3 that this problem can be solved in polynomial time for the interval uncertainty set \mathcal{U} . We now use this fact to provide some approximation algorithms for the problem under scenario sets $\mathcal{U}(\Gamma^c)$ and $\mathcal{U}(\Gamma^d)$, whose computational complexity status is unknown in acyclic multidigraphs. Let

$$F(X) = \left(\sum_{e \in X} C_e + \max_{S \in \mathcal{U}} \min_{Y \in \Phi(X, k)} \sum_{e \in Y} c_e^S \right),$$

where $\mathcal{U} \in \{\mathcal{U}(\Gamma^c), \mathcal{U}(\Gamma^d)\}$ and $\Phi(X, k)$ is one of the neighborhoods (1)–(3). Fix scenario $S \in \mathcal{U}$ and consider the problem

$$\text{REC SP } (S) : \min_{X \in \Phi, Y \in \Phi(X, k)} \left(\sum_{e \in X} C_e + \sum_{e \in Y} c_e^S \right).$$

The idea behind the construction of the approximation algorithms is to take into account the cost structure in scenario sets $\mathcal{U}(\Gamma^c)$ and $\mathcal{U}(\Gamma^d)$. Let $\alpha \geq (0, 1]$ be a constant such that $\hat{c}_e \geq \alpha(\hat{c}_e + \Delta_e)$ for each $e \in A$. This condition means that the maximum second-stage cost of any arc $e \in A$ can be at most $\frac{1}{\alpha}$ greater than its nominal cost. In practical applications, it can be unlikely that the value of α is very small as the maximum increase in the costs is typically limited. Notice that such a constant exists if $\hat{c}_e > 0$ for each $e \in A$. The following result has been established in [21] for the recoverable robust spanning tree problem (its proof for REC ROB SP is almost verbatim):

Lemma 7. [21, Lemma 6] *Suppose that $\hat{c}_e \geq \alpha(\hat{c}_e + \Delta_e)$ for each $e \in A$, where $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, and let (\hat{X}, \hat{Y}) be an optimal solution to REC SP (S) for $S = (\hat{c}_e)_{e \in A}$. Then $F(\hat{X}) \leq \frac{1}{\alpha} F(X)$ for each $X \in \Phi$.*

Lemma 7 is true for both uncertainty sets $\mathcal{U}(\Gamma^d)$ and $\mathcal{U}(\Gamma^c)$. Let us now focus only on $\mathcal{U}(\Gamma^c)$. Let $D = \sum_{e \in A} \Delta_e > 0$ be the total deviation of the second-stage arc costs from their nominal values. The value of D can be seen as a total uncertainty in the second-stage arc costs. Define scenario S' in which $c_e^{S'} = \min\{\hat{c}_e + \Delta_e, \hat{c}_e + \Gamma^c \frac{\Delta_e}{D}\}$, $e \in A$. It is easy to see that $S' \in \mathcal{U}(\Gamma^c)$, since $\sum_{e \in A} (c_e^{S'} - \hat{c}_e) \leq \sum_{e \in A} \Gamma^c \frac{\Delta_e}{D} = \Gamma^c$. Let (\hat{X}, \hat{Y}) be an optimal solution to REC SP (S') . Suppose that we can find two constants $\beta \in (0, 1]$ and $\gamma \in [0, 1)$ such that $\beta D \leq \Gamma^c \leq \gamma F(\hat{X})$. The constants β and γ relate the budget Γ^c to the total deviation D and the total cost of the heuristic solution \hat{X} . The following lemma has been proven in [21] for the recoverable robust spanning tree problem (again, its proof for REC ROB SP is almost verbatim):

Lemma 8. [21, Lemma 7] Assume that $\mathbb{U} = \mathcal{U}(\Gamma^c)$ and let (\hat{X}, \hat{Y}) be an optimal solution to REC SP (S'). Then, the following implications are true:

(a) if $\Gamma^c \geq \beta D$ for $\beta \in (0, 1]$, then $F(\hat{X}) \leq \frac{1}{\beta} F(X)$ for each $X \in \Phi$,

(b) if $\Gamma^c \leq \gamma F(\hat{X})$ for $\gamma \in [0, 1)$, then $F(\hat{X}) \leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma} F(X)$ for each $X \in \Phi$.

Observe that REC SP (S) can be solved in polynomial time in acyclic multidigraphs, according to the results shown in Section 3 (it is equivalent to REC SP with $\bar{c}_e = c_e^S$, $e \in A$). The value of $F(X)$ for a given $X \in \Phi$ can be computed in polynomial time for scenario set $\mathcal{U}(\Gamma^c)$ and the neighborhood $\Phi^{\text{incl}}(X, k)$, see [33], where the time-expanded network approach [1] was applied. The same technique can be applied to computing the value of $F(X)$ for $\mathcal{U}(\Gamma^c)$ and the neighborhoods $\Phi^{\text{excl}}(X, k)$ and $\Phi^{\text{sym}}(X, k)$ in polynomial time in acyclic multidigraphs. From this, it follows that one can verify the condition (b) from Lemma 8 in polynomial time. Therefore, Lemma 7 and Lemma 8 imply the following approximation results, where α , β and γ are the constants from these lemmas:

Corollary 1. The REC ROB SP in acyclic multidigraphs is approximable within $\frac{1}{\alpha}$ for scenario set $\mathcal{U}(\Gamma^d)$ and within $\min\{\frac{1}{\alpha}, \frac{1}{\beta}, \frac{1}{1-\gamma}\}$ for scenario set $\mathcal{U}(\Gamma^c)$.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we have discussed the recoverable robust shortest path problem under various interval scenario sets and neighborhoods. The main results are polynomial time algorithms for acyclic multidigraphs and the traditional interval uncertainty. In addition, we have strengthened the known hardness results for general multidigraphs and provided some new results for the budgeted interval uncertainty. In particular, we have proposed a compact MIP formulation for the continuous budgeted uncertainty and some approximation algorithms for acyclic multidigraphs. There are still several open questions regarding the problem being considered. Perhaps the most interesting one is the characterization of the complexity of the recoverable robust problem in acyclic multidigraphs under budgeted uncertainty. The problem is known to be hard only for general multidigraphs. A polynomial time algorithm may exist in general acyclic multidigraphs or for some of their special cases (layered, arc series-parallel, etc.). It is also interesting to provide a more detailed characterization of the problem from the parameterized complexity point of view.

Acknowledgements

The authors were supported by the National Science Centre, Poland, grant 2022/45/B/HS4/00355.

References

- [1] R. K. Ahuja, T. L. Magnanti, and J. B. Orlin. *Network flows: theory, algorithms, and applications*. Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1993.
- [2] D. Bertsimas and M. Sim. Robust discrete optimization and network flows. *Mathematical Programming*, 98:49–71, 2003.
- [3] D. Bertsimas and M. Sim. The price of robustness. *Operations Research*, 52:35–53, 2004.

- [4] M. Bold and M. Goerigk. Investigating the recoverable robust single machine scheduling problem under interval uncertainty. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 313:99–114, 2022.
- [5] M. Bold and M. Goerigk. Recoverable robust single machine scheduling with polyhedral uncertainty. Technical report, arXiv:2011.06284, 2022.
- [6] T. Bui, Q., Y. Deville, and Q. D. Pham. Exact methods for solving the elementary shortest and longest path problems. *Annals of Operations Research*, 244:313–348, 2016.
- [7] C. Büsing. *Recoverable robustness in combinatorial optimization*. PhD thesis, Technical University of Berlin, Berlin, 2011.
- [8] C. Büsing. Recoverable robust shortest path problems. *Networks*, 59:181–189, 2012.
- [9] C. Büsing, S. Goderbauer, A. M. Koster, and M. Kutschka. Formulations and algorithms for the recoverable γ -robust knapsack problem. *EURO Journal on Computational Optimization*, 7:15–45, 2019.
- [10] C. Büsing, A. M. Koster, and M. Kutschka. Recoverable robust knapsacks: Γ -scenarios. In *Network Optimization*, pages 583–588. Springer, 2011.
- [11] A. Chassein and M. Goerigk. On the recoverable robust traveling salesman problem. *Optimization Letters*, 10:1479–1492, 2016.
- [12] A. Chassein, M. Goerigk, A. Kasperski, and P. Zieliński. On recoverable and two-stage robust selection problems with budgeted uncertainty. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 265:423–436, 2018.
- [13] O. Şeref, R. K. Ahuja, and J. B. Orlin. Incremental network optimization: theory and algorithms. *Operations Research*, 57:586–594, 2009.
- [14] D. Fischer, T. A. Hartmann, S. Lendl, and G. J. Woeginger. An investigation of the recoverable robust assignment problem. In *16th International Symposium on Parameterized and Exact Computation, IPEC 2021*, pages 19:1–19:14, 2021.
- [15] J. Flum and M. Grohe. *Parameterized Complexity Theory*. Springer-Verlag, 2006.
- [16] S. Fortune, J. Hopcroft, and J. Wyllie. The directed subgraph homeomorphism problem. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 10:111–121, 1980.
- [17] M. R. Garey and D. S. Johnson. *Computers and Intractability. A Guide to the Theory of NP-Completeness*. W. H. Freeman and Company, 1979.
- [18] M. Goerigk, S. Lendl, and L. Wulf. On the recoverable traveling salesman problem. Technical report, arXiv:2111.09691, 2021.
- [19] M. Goerigk, S. Lendl, and L. Wulf. On the complexity of robust multi-stage problems with discrete recourse. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 343:355–370, 2024.
- [20] R. Hassin. Approximation schemes for the restricted shortest path problem. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 17:36–42, 1992.

- [21] M. Hradovich, A. Kasperski, and P. Zieliński. Recoverable robust spanning tree problem under interval uncertainty representations. *Journal of Combinatorial Optimization*, 34:554–573, 2017.
- [22] M. Hradovich, A. Kasperski, and P. Zieliński. The recoverable robust spanning tree problem with interval costs is polynomially solvable. *Optimization Letters*, 11:17–30, 2017.
- [23] M. Hradovich, A. Kasperski, and P. Zieliński. Robust recoverable 0–1 optimization problems under polyhedral uncertainty. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 278:136–148, 2019.
- [24] T. Ito, N. Kakimura, N. Kamiyama, Y. Kobayashi, and Y. Okamoto. A parameterized view to the robust recoverable base problem of matroids under structural uncertainty. *Operations Research Letters*, 50:370–375, 2022.
- [25] M. Jackiewicz, A. Kasperski, and P. Zieliński. Computational complexity of the recoverable robust shortest path problem with discrete recourse. Technical report, arXiv:2403.20000, 2024.
- [26] A. Kasperski and P. Zieliński. Robust recoverable and two-stage selection problems. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 233:52–64, 2017.
- [27] P. Kouvelis and G. Yu. *Robust Discrete Optimization and its Applications*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1997.
- [28] T. Lachmann, S. Lendl, and G. J. Woeginger. A linear time algorithm for the robust recoverable selection problem. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 303:94–107, 2021.
- [29] T. Lee and C. Kwon. A short note on the robust combinatorial optimization problems with cardinality constrained uncertainty. *4OR*, 12:373–378, 2014.
- [30] S. Lendl, B. Peis, and V. Timmermans. Matroid bases with cardinality constraints on the intersection. *Mathematical Programming*, 194:661–684, 2022.
- [31] C. Liebchen, M. E. Lübbecke, R. H. Möhring, and S. Stiller. The concept of recoverable robustness, linear programming recovery, and railway applications. In *Robust and Online Large-Scale Optimization*, volume 5868 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 1–27. Springer-Verlag, 2009.
- [32] E. Miller, C., A. W. Tucker, and R. A. Zemlin. Integer programming formulation of traveling salesman problems. *Journal of the ACM*, 7:326–329, 1960.
- [33] E. Nasrabadi and J. B. Orlin. Robust optimization with incremental recourse. *CoRR*, abs/1312.4075, 2013.
- [34] G. Naves and A. Sebő. Multiflow feasibility: An annotated tableau. In W. Cook, L. Lovász, and J. Vygen, editors, *Research Trends in Combinatorial Optimization*, pages 261–283. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2009.
- [35] J. Valdes, R. E. Tarjan, and E. L. Lawler. The recognition of series parallel digraphs. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 11:298–313, 1982.

- [36] G. J. Woeginger. The trouble with the second quantifier. *4OR - A Quarterly Journal of Operations Research*, 19:157–181, 2021.
- [37] B. Zeng and L. Zhao. Solving two-stage robust optimization problems using a column and constraint generation method. *Operation Research Letters*, 41:457–461, 2013.

A Appendix

We show two examples that demonstrate that adding the anti-cycling constraints (15)–(18) to the MIP formulation is necessary, even if all first and second-stage arc costs are positive.




Figure 4: Two sample graphs $G = (V, A)$ with the first and second-stage arc costs C_e, \bar{c}_e , $e \in A$, respectively, where M is a big constant. The paths in bold are the optimal first-stage paths.

Consider the sample digraph shown in Figure 4a. Choose the arc inclusion neighborhood and the recovery parameter $k = 3$. The total cost of any solution to this problem is at least M . Indeed, to achieve the cost less than M we have to choose the path $X = \{(s, v_1), (v_1, v_2), (v_2, v_3), (v_3, t)\}$ as the first-stage path. However, achieving the cost of the second-stage path less than M requires including more than 3 new arcs. Suppose that we remove the anti-cycling constraints (15)–(18) from the description of $\chi(\Phi)$. Then $X' = X \cup \mathcal{C}_1 \cup \mathcal{C}_2$, where \mathcal{C}_1 and \mathcal{C}_2 are directed cycles depicted in Figure 4a, is a feasible first-stage solution to the MIP formulation. Its cost equals 10, which is less than M . We can now obtain a feasible second-stage solution $Y = \{(s, v_4), (v_4, v_8), (v_8, v_5), (v_5, v_6), (v_6, v_9), (v_9, v_7), (v_7, t)\}$ with the cost equal to 7 (observe that only 3 new arcs are added to X'). The total cost of the solution obtained is 17, which is less than M . Thus, this example demonstrates that we have to add the anti-cycling constraints to the description of $\chi(\Phi)$.

Consider the sample digraph shown in Figure 4b. Choose the arc-exclusion neighborhood and the recovery parameter $k = 1$. The total cost of any solution to this problem is at least M . Indeed, to achieve a less cost we have to choose $X = \{(s, v_1), (v_1, v_2), (v_2, t)\}$ as the first-stage path. The cost of this path equals 3. However, the cost of the second-stage path Y is then at least M because each simple s - t path in the neighborhood of X must contain the arc (s, v_1) . If we remove the anti-cycling constraints from the description of $\chi(\Phi^{\text{excl}}(\mathbf{x}, k))$, then we can choose $Y = \{(s, t), (t, v_1), (v_1, v_2), (v_2, v_1), (v_1, t)\}$, which is now feasible and has the cost equal to 4. Observe that the path Y is not simple. Similar reasoning applies to the arc symmetric difference neighborhood. It is enough to set the recovery parameter $k = 3$.

This example shows that we have to add the anti-cycling constraints to the description of $\chi(\Phi^{\text{excl}}(\mathbf{x}, k))$ and $\chi(\Phi^{\text{sym}}(\mathbf{x}, k))$.