

SOLVING DECISION-DEPENDENT ROBUST PROBLEMS AS BILEVEL OPTIMIZATION PROBLEMS

HENRI LEFEBVRE, MARTIN SCHMIDT, SIMON STEVENS, JOHANNES THÜRAUF

ABSTRACT. Both bilevel and robust optimization are established fields of mathematical optimization and operations research. However, only until recently, the similarities in their mathematical structure has neither been studied theoretically nor exploited computationally. Based on the recent results by Goerigk et al. (2025), this paper is the first one that reformulates a given strictly robust optimization problem with a decision-dependent uncertainty set as an equivalent bilevel optimization problem and then uses solution techniques from the latter field to solve the robust problem at hand. If the uncertainty set can be dualized, the respective bilevel techniques to obtain a single-level reformulation are very similar compared to the classic dualization techniques used in robust optimization but lead to larger single-level problems to be solved. Our numerical study shows that this leads to larger computation times but may also slightly improve the dual bound. For the more challenging case of a decision-dependent uncertainty set that cannot be dualized because it is represented as a mixed-integer linear problem, we are not aware of any applicable robust optimization techniques. Fortunately, by exploiting the corresponding bilevel reformulation and recent bilevel solvers, we are able to present the first numerical results for this class of robust problems.

1. INTRODUCTION

Bilevel optimization deals with models of hierarchical decision making in which a so-called leader acts first, while anticipating the optimal reaction of the so-called follower, whose decision depends on the one of the leader. For a general overview of bilevel optimization we refer to Dempe (2002) and Dempe et al. (2015) and the more recent surveys by Kleinert et al. (2021) and Beck et al. (2023). Hence, the overall structure is that of a nested optimization problem. In robust optimization, one only considers a single-decision maker but explicitly takes into consideration that this agent has to make a decision under uncertainty. In classic robust optimization, the decision is taken before the uncertainty realizes and this uncertainty is assumed to realize in the worst-case sense, which again is represented by a nested optimization problem (Soyster 1973; Ben-Tal et al. 2009). Hence, both types of problems—although being introduced to model completely different aspects of real-world decision making—exhibit a rather similar mathematical structure.

To the best of our knowledge, the first publication in which this similarity has been observed is the one by Stein (2013) in the context of (generalized) semi-infinite optimization. Nevertheless, the literature on robust and bilevel optimization has been rather disjoint. Besides some comments in this direction by Leyffer et al. (2020), the first systematic study of the similarities and the differences of the mathematical structure of bilevel and robust optimization has been recently published by Goerigk et al. (2025). In particular, the authors show the equivalence of certain classes of

Date: March 4, 2025.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 90C70, 90C17, 91A65.

Key words and phrases. Robust optimization, Decision-dependent uncertainty sets, Endogenous uncertainty, Bilevel optimization.

robust and bilevel optimization problems, paving the way for using the methods from one field to solve problems from the other one. In this paper, we will exploit the particular equivalence between bilevel optimization and decision-dependent robust optimization to solve the latter, for which the literature is rather sparse.

One of the main concerns in robust optimization is to reduce the conservatism that is inherent to robust counterparts and their solutions. Many developments have thus focused on less conservative approaches for modeling the uncertainty sets, including polyhedral, ellipsoidal (Ben-Tal and Nemirovski 1999) or budgeted (Bertsimas and Sim 2003) uncertainty sets. These approaches often provide a more realistic representation of uncertainties, thereby resulting in less conservative solutions. In addition to traditional robust optimization, adaptive robust optimization and decision-dependent robust optimization (DDRO) have gained more attention in recent years. The former incorporates dynamic decision-making that adapts as uncertainties unfold, typically modeled using a multi-stage structure as in Bertsimas et al. (2011) and as in the survey by Yanıkoğlu et al. (2019). This approach may significantly reduce the conservatism of the model. DDRO addresses situations in which uncertainties are modeled as being dependent on the decision variables, enabling some control over these uncertainties within the model.

Decision-dependent uncertainties are sometimes also called endogenous uncertainties and were initially introduced in the context of stochastic optimization problems; see, e.g., Jonsbråten et al. (1998). Since then, several papers on this topic have been published in the field of stochastic optimization (Zhan et al. 2016; Apap and Grossmann 2017; Hellemo et al. 2018; Motamed Nasab and Li 2021), to name just a few.

Within robust optimization, however, the field of decision-dependent uncertainty is less mature. Notable methodological contributions include the work of Nohadani and Sharma (2018), who consider shortest path problems with decision-dependent uncertainties in the arc lengths. Similarly, Poss (2013) and Poss (2014) examine combinatorial optimization problems such as the knapsack problem under budgeted uncertainty sets as well as under knapsack uncertainties. Furthermore, decision-dependent robust optimization is also of interest in many application areas such as software partitioning (Spacey et al. 2012), scheduling (Lappas and Gounaris 2016; Vujanic et al. 2016), energy networks (Aigner et al. 2022), or health care (Zhu et al. 2022). Finally, in recent years, decision-dependent uncertainties have also been explored within more specialized fields of robust optimization, such as two-stage and multistage robust optimization (Zhang and Feng 2020; Avraamidou and Pistikopoulos 2020; Zeng and Wang 2022) or distributionally robust optimization (Luo and Mehrotra 2020; Feng et al. 2021; Basciftci et al. 2021; Yu and Shen 2022; Doan 2022; Ryu and Jiang 2025).

To the best of our knowledge, all techniques to solve single-level DDRO problems rely on dualization or problem-specific knowledge to reformulate the robust optimization problem as a finite-dimensional problem consisting of finitely many variables and constraints. Consequently, these approaches are generally limited to cases with continuous and convex uncertainty sets that can be dualized, i.e., for which a strong-duality theorem is available. If such a theorem is not available, e.g., in cases in which the decision-dependent uncertainty set is represented as a mixed-integer linear model, we are not aware of any general-purpose methods to solve the respective decision-dependent robust problems.

In this context, our contribution is the following. We use the recent result by Goerigk et al. (2025) showing that decision-dependent robust optimization problems can be equivalently reformulated as bilevel optimization problems. First, we consider classic operations-research problems that have already been studied in the literature

on DDRO: the shortest path problem, also considered by Nohadani and Sharma (2018) in the DDRO setting, the knapsack problem, also considered by Poss (2013) and Poss (2014) in DDRO, and the portfolio optimization problem in its DDRO version. For the case of continuous and convex decision-dependent uncertainty sets, we derive the single-level reformulation of the corresponding bilevel problem, solve it, and compare it with solving the given problem using classic dualization techniques from robust optimization and standard linearization techniques à la McCormick (1976). Our numerical results reveal that the bilevel problem leads to larger computation times (mainly due to larger model sizes) but in some cases may also lead to slightly improved dual bounds. Second, we consider the first two of the three mentioned problems but with decision-dependent uncertainty sets for which classic dualization techniques are not applicable. Here, to the best of our knowledge, there are no general-purpose solution techniques available in the literature. However, we then use the most recent advances in mixed-integer linear bilevel optimization and solve the corresponding bilevel problem using the publicly available open-source solver MibS (DeNegre et al. 2024; DeNegre and Ralphs 2009; Tahernejad and Ralphs 2020). This allows us to present the first numerical results in the literature for this class of problems.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, we present the nominal shortest path problem, the models of the robust counterpart with continuous and convex decision-dependent uncertainty sets, and the bilevel reformulation in case of a discrete uncertainty set. The same is done for the knapsack problem in Section 3 and for the portfolio optimization problem in Section 4. The numerical results are presented and discussed in Section 5 and we conclude the paper with some comments on future research questions in Section 6.

2. THE SHORTEST PATH PROBLEM

We study different reformulation techniques for the shortest path problem under decision-dependent uncertainty. To this end, we start with the nominal problem in Section 2.1. We then introduce cost uncertainties using a continuous decision-dependent uncertainty set as described in Nohadani and Sharma (2018); see Section 2.2. To derive the corresponding single-level reformulation, we apply the standard, duality-based reformulation technique of robust optimization in Section 2.2.1. As a comparison, we also derive two alternative reformulations by exploiting connections between bilevel and robust optimization recently drawn in Goerigk et al. (2025); see Section 2.2.2. Finally, we turn to the case of a discrete decision-dependent uncertainty set, for which the duality-based techniques of robust optimization cannot be applied. However, we can again apply the bilevel reformulation in this discrete case; see Section 2.3.

2.1. Nominal Model. To model the nominal shortest path problem, we consider a directed graph $G = (V, A)$, where V is the set of all nodes and A is the set of all arcs. The objective is to find a shortest path from a given source node $s \in V$ to a target node $t \in V$ with $t \neq s$. For an arc $a \in A$, the variable y_a models whether the arc a is to be chosen in the computed shortest path and is therefore binary. The nominal costs for using arc $a \in A$ are given by $d_a \geq 0$. The only constraints of the model are the flow conservation constraints

$$\sum_{a \in \delta^{\text{in}}(v)} y_a - \sum_{a \in \delta^{\text{out}}(v)} y_a = \begin{cases} 1, & v = t, \\ -1, & v = s, \ v \in V, \\ 0, & \text{else,} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

in which we denote the ingoing and outgoing arcs of the node $v \in V$ by the sets $\delta^{\text{in}}(v) := \{(u, v) \in A : u \in V \setminus \{v\}\}$ and $\delta^{\text{out}}(v) := \{(v, u) \in A : u \in V \setminus \{v\}\}$. Since

we minimize the costs, we obtain the nominal model

$$\min_{y \in \{0,1\}^{|A|}} \sum_{a \in A} d_a y_a \quad \text{s.t.} \quad (1). \quad (2)$$

2.2. Robust Counterpart with Continuous Budgeted Uncertainty Set.

In the following, we assume decision-dependent uncertainties in the costs d_a in form of a continuous budgeted uncertainty set as in Nohadani and Sharma (2018). To this end, we introduce the nominal cost $\bar{d}_a \geq 0$ on arc a and the maximum deviation of the cost $\hat{d}_a \geq 0$. Reducing the uncertainty for arc a by, e.g., investing in development of the road network, leads to hedging costs represented by $c_a \geq 0$. The new variable x_a models this decision whether to reduce the uncertainty on arc a or not. The objective function in Problem (2) is therefore modified to obtain the uncertain shortest path problem

$$\min_{x,y} \sum_{a \in A} c_a x_a + \sum_{a \in A} \bar{d}_a y_a + \max_{u \in U_{\text{sp}}^{\text{cb}}(x)} \sum_{a \in A} u_a \hat{d}_a y_a \quad (3a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad (1), \quad x, y \in \{0,1\}^{|A|}. \quad (3b)$$

with the decision-dependent budgeted uncertainty set

$$U_{\text{sp}}^{\text{cb}}(x) := \left\{ u \in \mathbb{R}^{|A|} : \sum_{a \in A} u_a \leq \Gamma, \quad u_a \leq 1 - \gamma_a x_a, \quad u_a \geq 0, \quad a \in A \right\}. \quad (4)$$

The parameter $\Gamma \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ is called the uncertainty budget. For each arc $a \in A$, the parameter $\gamma_a \in [0, 1]$ is the given fraction of uncertainty that will be reduced, if x_a is chosen to be 1. We note that for fixed decisions $x \in \{0,1\}^{|A|}$, the uncertainty set $U_{\text{sp}}^{\text{cb}}(x)$ is continuous and polyhedral.

2.2.1. Classic Robust Approach. In the following, we review the classic single-level reformulation of Problem (3) as in Nohadani and Sharma (2018). To this end, we apply the standard dualization technique of robust optimization. We start by dualizing the inner maximization problem

$$\max_u \sum_{a \in A} u_a \hat{d}_a y_a \quad (5a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{a \in A} u_a \leq \Gamma, \quad (5b)$$

$$0 \leq u_a \leq 1 - \gamma_a x_a, \quad a \in A, \quad (5c)$$

which results in the dual problem

$$\min_{\pi, \lambda} \quad \pi \Gamma + \sum_{a \in A} \lambda_a (1 - \gamma_a x_a) \quad (6a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \pi + \lambda_a \geq \hat{d}_a y_a, \quad a \in A, \quad (6b)$$

$$\pi, \lambda \geq 0. \quad (6c)$$

By strong duality, the dual problem (6) has the same optimal objective function value as the primal problem (5). Therefore, we can replace the inner maximization problem by its dual. Thus, Problem (3) can now be expressed as

$$\min_{x,y,\pi,\lambda} \sum_{a \in A} c_a x_a + \sum_{a \in A} \bar{d}_a y_a + \pi \Gamma + \sum_{a \in A} \lambda_a (1 - \gamma_a x_a) \quad (7a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad (1), \quad x, y \in \{0,1\}^{|A|}, \quad (7b)$$

$$\pi + \lambda_a \geq \hat{d}_a y_a, \quad a \in A, \quad (7c)$$

$$\pi, \lambda \geq 0. \quad (7d)$$

Since for each arc $a \in A$, the variable $x_a \in \{0, 1\}$ is binary, the bilinear terms $\lambda_a x_a$ in the objective function (7a) can be linearized using McCormick inequalities (McCormick 1976) of the form

$$r_a \leq M_a x_a, \quad r_a \leq \lambda_a, \quad \lambda_a - M_a(1 - x_a) \leq r_a, \quad r_a \geq 0, \quad a \in A,$$

with the upper bounds $M_a = \hat{d}_a \geq \lambda_a$ for all $a \in A$.

2.2.2. Bilevel Approaches. We now exploit the recently drawn connections between bilevel and robust optimization to obtain another single-level reformulation of the uncertain problem (3). According to Goerigk et al. (2025), Problem (3) is equivalent to the bilevel problem

$$\min_{x,y,u} \sum_{a \in A} c_a x_a + \sum_{a \in A} \bar{d}_a y_a + \sum_{a \in A} u_a \hat{d}_a y_a \quad (8a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad (1), \quad x, y \in \{0, 1\}^{|A|}, \quad (8b)$$

$$u \in S_{\text{sp}}^{\text{cb}}(x, y), \quad (8c)$$

where $S_{\text{sp}}^{\text{cb}}(x, y)$ is the set of globally optimal solutions to the (x, y) -parameterized lower-level problem (5). Here, the optimality of the lower-level problem corresponds to the maximum cost deviation, representing the worst-case scenario in a robust sense. Note that Goerigk et al. (2025) proved the equivalence only for uncertainties in the constraints. However, this is without loss of generality, as we can always write Problem (3) in its epigraph reformulation.

Since the lower-level problem of (8) is linear, we can derive an equivalent single-level reformulation using strong duality or the Karush–Kuhn–Tucker (KKT) conditions. In the following, we present both of these single-level reformulations, starting with the strong-duality approach.

Dualizing the lower-level problem (5) again leads to Problem (6). Since Problems (5) and (6) are linear problems, strong duality holds if and only if

$$\pi \Gamma + \sum_{a \in A} \lambda_a (1 - \gamma_a x_a) \leq \sum_{a \in A} u_a \hat{d}_a y_a$$

is satisfied. Therefore, we can reformulate the bilevel problem (8) as the single-level problem

$$\min_{x,y,u,\pi,\lambda} \sum_{a \in A} c_a x_a + \sum_{a \in A} \bar{d}_a y_a + \sum_{a \in A} u_a \hat{d}_a y_a \quad (9a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad (1), \quad x, y \in \{0, 1\}^{|A|}, \quad (9b)$$

$$\sum_{a \in A} u_a \leq \Gamma, \quad (9c)$$

$$u_a \leq 1 - \gamma_a x_a, \quad a \in A, \quad (9d)$$

$$\pi + \lambda_a \geq \hat{d}_a y_a, \quad a \in A, \quad (9e)$$

$$\pi \Gamma + \sum_{a \in A} \lambda_a (1 - \gamma_a x_a) \leq \sum_{a \in A} u_a \hat{d}_a y_a, \quad (9f)$$

$$u, \pi, \lambda \geq 0. \quad (9g)$$

Again, we can reformulate the bilinearities $\lambda_a x_a$ and $u_a y_a$ using McCormick inequalities and the upper bounds $\hat{d}_a \geq \lambda_a$ and $1 \geq u_a$ for all $a \in A$.

We now also present the single-level reformulation of the bilevel problem (8) based on the KKT conditions. Starting with the bilevel problem (8), the Lagrangian

of the lower-level problem (5) reads

$$\mathcal{L}(u, \pi, \lambda) := \sum_{a \in A} u_a \hat{d}_a y_a + \pi \left(\Gamma - \sum_{a \in A} u_a \right) + \sum_{a \in A} \lambda_a^+ (1 - \gamma_a x_a - u_a) + \sum_{a \in A} \lambda_a^- u_a.$$

Since the lower-level problem is a linear problem, the KKT conditions are necessary and sufficient. Therefore, we can reformulate problem (8) as

$$\min_{x, y, u, \pi, \lambda^+, \lambda^-} \sum_{a \in A} c_a x_a + \sum_{a \in A} \bar{d}_a y_a + \sum_{a \in A} u_a \hat{d}_a y_a \quad (10a)$$

$$\text{s.t. (1), } x, y \in \{0, 1\}^{|A|}, \quad (10b)$$

$$\sum_{a \in A} u_a \leq \Gamma, \quad (10c)$$

$$u_a \leq 1 - \gamma_a x_a, \quad a \in A, \quad (10d)$$

$$\hat{d}_a y_a = \pi + \lambda_a^+ - \lambda_a^-, \quad a \in A, \quad (10e)$$

$$\pi \left(\Gamma - \sum_{a \in A} u_a \right) = 0, \quad (10f)$$

$$\lambda_a^+ (1 - \gamma_a x_a - u_a) = 0, \quad a \in A, \quad (10g)$$

$$\lambda_a^- u_a = 0, \quad a \in A, \quad (10h)$$

$$\pi, \lambda^+, \lambda^-, u \geq 0. \quad (10i)$$

The complementarity constraints (10f), (10g), and (10h) can be reformulated using a big- M reformulation with the bounds $\pi \leq \max_a \hat{d}_a$, $\Gamma - \sum_{a \in A} u_a \leq \Gamma$, $\lambda_a^+ \leq \hat{d}_a$, $1 - \gamma_a x_a - u_a \leq 1$, and $\lambda_a^- \leq \max_a \hat{d}_a + \hat{d}_a$, $a \in A$. The bilinearity $u_a y_a$ in the objective function is reformulated using McCormick inequalities and the bound $u_a \leq 1$, $a \in A$.

A comparison of the derived reformulations in terms of problem size can be found in Table 1. Nonnegativity conditions of variables are counted as constraints. The duality-based bilevel reformulation contains additional variables and constraints resulting from the primal lower-level problem, modeling the uncertainty set, and the strong-duality constraint. Moreover, also the number of bilinearities increases, which results in more auxiliary variables and corresponding McCormick constraints. The KKT-based reformulation even adds more constraints since the complementarity constraints need to be linearized as well.

2.3. Robust Counterpart with Discrete Knapsack Uncertainty Set. Instead of the continuous uncertainty set $U_{\text{sp}}^{\text{cb}}(x)$ in (4), we now consider a discrete uncertainty set of the form

$$U_{\text{sp}}^{\text{dk}}(x) := \left\{ u \in \{0, 1\}^{|A|} : \sum_{a \in A} f_a u_a \leq b(x) \right\}. \quad (11)$$

Here, the decision-dependence lies in the uncertainty budget $b(x)$ instead of the fraction of uncertainty reduction. The uncertainty budget is defined as a function of x given by $b(x) = b - w^\top x$ with $w \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}$. Moreover, the constraints in the uncertainty set can be seen as knapsack constraints with weights $f_a \geq 0$.

Note that, due to the binary structure of the uncertainty set (11), we are no longer able to dualize the inner maximization problem. Therefore, we cannot derive a single-level reformulation using the standard dualization technique of robust optimization; see Section 2.2.1. However, we can still reformulate the problem as a bilevel problem. According to Goerigk et al. (2025), the decision-dependent

TABLE 1. Comparison of the model sizes, i.e., the number of variables and constraints, of the reformulations for the uncertain shortest path problem (3) dependent on the number of arcs $|A|$ and nodes $|V|$. The continuous auxiliary variables include the ones for the McCormick linearization and the binary ones follow from the linearization of the complementarity constraints.

	Robust (7)	Bilevel	
		Duality (9)	KKT (10)
Continuous variables	$ A + 1$	$2 A + 1$	$3 A + 1$
Binary variables	$2 A $	$2 A $	$2 A $
Continuous auxiliary variables	$ A $	$2 A $	$ A $
Binary auxiliary variables	—	—	$2 A + 1$
Constraints	$2 A + V + 1$	$4 A + V + 3$	$5 A + V + 2$
McCormick constraints	$4 A $	$8 A $	$4 A $
Linearized compl. constraints	—	—	$4 A + 2$

uncertain optimization problem with discrete uncertainty set (11) is equivalent to the bilevel problem

$$\min_{x,y,u} \sum_{a \in A} c_a x_a + \sum_{a \in A} \bar{d}_a y_a + \sum_{a \in A} u_a \hat{d}_a y_a \quad (12a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } (1), x, y \in \{0, 1\}^{|A|}, \quad (12b)$$

$$u \in S_{\text{sp}}^{\text{d}}(x, y), \quad (12c)$$

where $S_{\text{sp}}^{\text{d}}(x, y)$ is the set of optimal solutions to the (x, y) -parameterized lower-level problem

$$\begin{aligned} \max_u \quad & \sum_{a \in A} u_a \hat{d}_a y_a \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{a \in A} f_a u_a \leq b(x), \\ & u \in \{0, 1\}^{|A|}. \end{aligned}$$

We can linearize the bilinearities $u_a y_a$ by introducing McCormick inequalities with the bounds $1 \geq u_i$, $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ to the lower-level problem. The auxiliary variable w then becomes a lower-level variable. For the correctness of tackling these terms (that appear both in the upper and the lower level), we refer to Appendix A.

Due to the binary lower-level variable u , we are not able to reformulate this bilevel problem as a single-level problem using duality theory. Nevertheless, this bilevel problem can be solved with standard techniques for MILP-MILP bilevel problems; see, e.g., Kleinert et al. (2021) for a recent survey. In Section 5, we use the state-of-the-art bilevel solver MibS (DeNegre et al. 2024), which can be applied to solve Problem (12).

3. THE KNAPSACK PROBLEM

We now study knapsack problems with decision-dependent uncertainties following the structure of the previous section. After presenting the nominal model, we introduce weight uncertainties in Section 3.2. Then, for a continuous knapsack uncertainty set, we derive the classic single-level reformulation of robust optimization in Section 3.2.1 and the duality-based bilevel reformulation in Section 3.2.2.

Moreover, we again study a budgeted uncertainty set, similar to the one previously used for the shortest path problems; see Section 3.3. We omit the derivation of the KKT reformulation for the case of knapsack problems due to its weak computational performance; see Section 5. Finally, we consider the case of a discrete decision-dependent uncertainty set and apply the bilevel reformulation to obtain a MILP-MILP bilevel problem in Section 3.4.

3.1. Nominal Model. Let a set of n items, each with value $c_i \geq 0$ and weight $a_i \geq 0$, be given. The goal is to choose a subset of these items so that the available capacity $d \geq 0$ of the knapsack is not exceeded and the overall value is maximized. This results in the nominal knapsack problem

$$\max_{x \in \{0,1\}^n} c^\top x \quad \text{s.t.} \quad a^\top x \leq d. \quad (13)$$

3.2. Robust Counterpart with Continuous Knapsack Uncertainty. We now consider decision-dependent uncertainties in the weights a_i in form of a continuous knapsack uncertainty set. To this end, we introduce the nominal weight $\bar{a}_i \geq 0$ of item i and the maximum deviation of the weight $\hat{a}_i \geq 0$. We then modify the constraint in (13) to obtain the uncertain knapsack problem

$$\max_{x \in \{0,1\}^n} c^\top x \quad (14a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{i=1}^n (\bar{a}_i + u_i \hat{a}_i) x_i \leq d \quad \forall u \in U_k^{\text{ck}}(x), \quad (14b)$$

with the decision-dependent knapsack uncertainty set

$$U_k^{\text{ck}}(x) := \left\{ u \in \mathbb{R}^n : 0 \leq u \leq 1, \sum_{i=1}^n f_i u_i \leq b(x) \right\}. \quad (15)$$

The uncertainty budget is defined as an affine function in x , given by $b(x) = b - w^\top x$ with $w \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Moreover, the constraints in the uncertainty set can be seen as continuous knapsack constraints with weights $f_i \geq 0$. Note that in this case, the uncertainties do not depend on additional hedging variables as in the previous section, but on the original decision variables x .

3.2.1. Classic Robust Approach. In the following, we derive the classic single-level reformulation from robust optimization for Problem (14) with the same dualization technique as used in Poss (2013). If Constraint (14b) holds for all $u \in U_k^{\text{ck}}(x)$, then it is satisfied for the maximum as well. Hence, the constraint can be re-written as

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \bar{a}_i x_i + \max_{u \in U_k^{\text{ck}}(x)} \sum_{i=1}^n u_i \hat{a}_i x_i \leq d.$$

We now dualize the inner maximization problem, leading to

$$\min_{\pi, \lambda} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i + \pi b(x) \quad (16a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \pi f_i + \lambda_i \geq \hat{a}_i x_i, \quad i \in \{1, \dots, n\}, \quad (16b)$$

$$\pi, \lambda \geq 0. \quad (16c)$$

Strong duality states that the optimal objective function values of the primal and dual problem are the same. Therefore, we can use these two problems equivalently.

By inserting this equivalent formulation of Constraint (14b) back into the original problem (14), we obtain the single-level problem

$$\max_{x, \pi, \lambda} c^\top x \quad (17a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{a}_i x_i + \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i + \pi b(x) \leq d, \quad (17b)$$

$$\pi f_i + \lambda_i \geq \hat{a}_i x_i, \quad i \in \{1, \dots, n\}, \quad (17c)$$

$$x \in \{0, 1\}^n, \quad \pi, \lambda \geq 0. \quad (17d)$$

Since for each item $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, the variable x_i is binary, the bilinear terms πx_i in Constraint (17b) can be linearized using McCormick inequalities with the upper bound $(\max_i \hat{a}_i / \min_i f_i) \geq \pi$.

3.2.2. Bilevel Approach. For knapsack problems, we focus on the duality-based bilevel reformulation. According to Goerigk et al. (2025), Problem (14) is equivalent to the bilevel problem

$$\max_{x, u} c^\top x \quad (18a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{i=1}^n (\bar{a}_i + u_i \hat{a}_i) x_i \leq d, \quad (18b)$$

$$x \in \{0, 1\}^n, \quad (18c)$$

$$u \in S_k^{\text{ck}}(x), \quad (18d)$$

where $S_k^{\text{ck}}(x)$ is the set of optimal solutions to the lower-level problem

$$\max_u \sum_{i=1}^n u_i \hat{a}_i x_i \quad (19a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{i=1}^n f_i u_i \leq b(x), \quad (19b)$$

$$0 \leq u \leq 1. \quad (19c)$$

Again, dualizing the lower-level problem (19) yields Problem (16). Strong duality states that every pair of primal and dual feasible points is optimal if

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i + \pi b(x) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n u_i \hat{a}_i x_i$$

holds. Therefore, we can reformulate the bilevel problem (18) as

$$\max_{x, u, \pi, \lambda} c^\top x \quad (20a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{i=1}^n (\bar{a}_i + u_i \hat{a}_i) x_i \leq d, \quad (20b)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n f_i u_i \leq b(x), \quad (20c)$$

$$\pi f_i + \lambda_i \geq \hat{a}_i x_i, \quad i \in \{1, \dots, n\}, \quad (20d)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i + \pi b(x) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n u_i \hat{a}_i x_i, \quad (20e)$$

$$u \leq 1, \quad (20f)$$

$$x \in \{0, 1\}^n, \quad u, \pi, \lambda \geq 0. \quad (20g)$$

TABLE 2. Comparison of the model sizes of the reformulations for the uncertain knapsack problem (14) depending on the number of items n . The auxiliary variables include the ones for the McCormick linearization.

	Robust (17)	Bilevel (20)
Continuous variables	$n + 1$	$2n + 1$
Binary variables	n	n
Continuous auxiliary variables	n	$2n$
Constraints	$2n + 2$	$4n + 4$
McCormick constraints	$4n$	$8n$

Again, for each item $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, we address the bilinearities πx_i and $u_i x_i$ in the constraints by applying the McCormick inequalities with the upper bounds $(\max_i \hat{a}_i / \min_i f_i) \geq \pi$ and $1 \geq u_i$, $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.

A comparison of the derived reformulations regarding the problem size is given in Table 2. As in Section 2.2, the bilevel reformulation leads to a larger model with more constraints and variables compared to the classic robust single-level reformulation. This is again due to the additional primal lower-level constraints and the constraints of the uncertainty set in the model.

3.3. Robust Counterpart with Continuous Budgeted Uncertainty Set. To facilitate a better comparison of the reformulations across the different problem types, we study again a decision-dependent budgeted uncertainty set as in Section 2.2. Here, $h \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ represents the costs for hedging against the uncertainties and the new variables $y_i \in \{0, 1\}$, $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, model the decision on whether to hedge against the uncertainties for item i or not. Thus, the budgeted uncertainty set is given by

$$U_k^{\text{cb}}(y) := \left\{ u \in \mathbb{R}^n : \sum_{i=1}^n u_i \leq \Gamma, u_i \leq 1 - \gamma_i y_i, u_i \geq 0, i \in \{1, \dots, n\} \right\}, \quad (21)$$

in which $\Gamma \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ represents the uncertainty budget, and $\gamma_i \in [0, 1]$ denotes the fraction by which uncertainty can be reduced. Building on the derivations of the prior models, this leads to the following reformulations.

The classic robust single-level reformulation reads

$$\max_{x, y, \pi, \lambda} c^\top x - h^\top y \quad (22a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{a}_i x_i + \pi \Gamma + \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i (1 - \gamma_i y_i) \leq d, \quad (22b)$$

$$\pi + \lambda_i \geq \hat{a}_i x_i, \quad i \in \{1, \dots, n\}, \quad (22c)$$

$$\pi, \lambda \geq 0, x, y \in \{0, 1\}^n, \quad (22d)$$

TABLE 3. Comparison of the model sizes of the reformulations for the uncertain knapsack problem with budgeted uncertainty set (21) dependent on the number of items n . The auxiliary variables include the ones for the McCormick linearization.

	Robust (22)	Bilevel (23)
Continuous variables	$n + 1$	$2n + 1$
Binary variables	$2n$	$2n$
Continuous auxiliary variables	n	$2n$
Constraints	$2n + 2$	$4n + 4$
McCormick constraints	$4n$	$8n$

and the bilevel reformulation is given by

$$\max_{x,y,\pi,\lambda,u} c^\top x - h^\top y \quad (23a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{a}_i x_i + \pi \Gamma + \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i (1 - \gamma_i y_i) \leq d, \quad (23b)$$

$$\pi + \lambda_i \geq \hat{a}_i x_i, \quad i \in \{1, \dots, n\}, \quad (23c)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n u_i \leq \Gamma, \quad (23d)$$

$$u_i \leq 1 - \gamma_i y_i, \quad i \in \{1, \dots, n\}, \quad (23e)$$

$$\pi \Gamma + \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i (1 - \gamma_i y_i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n u_i \hat{a}_i x_i, \quad (23f)$$

$$u, \pi, \lambda \geq 0, \quad x, y \in \{0, 1\}^n. \quad (23g)$$

Note that the dual objective function is used in (23b) instead of the primal objective function. This is in contrast to what is done in Model (20) in the previous section. Indeed, preliminary experiments have shown better computational performance for the stated model. The remaining bilinearities $\lambda_i y_i$ and $u_i x_i$ are again reformulated using McCormick inequalities with the upper bounds $\lambda_i \leq \hat{a}_i$ and $u_i \leq 1$, $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.

Table 3 presents a comparison of the derived reformulations in terms of problem size again showing that the classic robust single-level reformulation has less variables and constraints than the bilevel reformulation.

3.4. Robust Counterpart with Discrete Knapsack Uncertainty Set. Instead of a continuous knapsack uncertainty set $U_k^{\text{ck}}(x)$ in (15), we now consider the analogous discrete knapsack uncertainty $U_k^{\text{dk}}(x) := U_k^{\text{ck}}(x) \cap \{0, 1\}^n$.

Following the derivation of the bilevel reformulation for the continuous uncertainty set $U_k^{\text{ck}}(x)$, the resulting bilevel problem then reads

$$\max_{x,u} c^\top x \quad (24a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{i=1}^n (\bar{a}_i + u_i \hat{a}_i) x_i \leq d, \quad (24b)$$

$$x \in \{0, 1\}^n, \quad (24c)$$

$$u \in S_k^{\text{dk}}(x), \quad (24d)$$

with $S_k^{\text{dk}}(x)$ again being the set of optimal solutions to the lower-level problem

$$\begin{aligned} \max_u \quad & \sum_{i=1}^n u_i \hat{a}_i x_i \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{i=1}^n f_i u_i \leq b(x), \\ & u \in \{0, 1\}^n. \end{aligned}$$

The bilinearities $u_i x_i$ can again be reformulated using McCormick inequalities in the lower-level problem and the upper bounds $1 \geq u_i$, $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Further, the bilevel problem (24) can be solved with the bilevel solver `MibS`.

We note that we cannot derive a single-level reformulation with classic robust dualization techniques for this kind of uncertainty set due to the binary structure of $U_k^{\text{dk}}(x)$.

4. THE PORTFOLIO SELECTION PROBLEM

The final application of decision-dependent robust optimization that we consider is the portfolio selection problem. We start by modeling a nominal maximum return problem with cardinality constraints following Jin et al. (2016); see Section 4.1. Afterward, we present the uncertain problem with continuous decision-dependent uncertainty set in Section 4.2 and derive its classic robust single-level reformulation in Section 4.2.1 as well as the bilevel reformulation in Section 4.2.2. We conclude by examining the case of a discrete uncertainty set and the corresponding bilevel reformulation; see Section 4.3.

4.1. Nominal Model. In the considered model, investors allocate their budget across $N \in \mathbb{N}$ different assets by assigning weights $y_i \in [0, 1]$ to each asset $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$. These weights have to add up to one, i.e., the entire budget has to be invested. We do not allow negative weights, thereby prohibiting short positions. The expected return of asset i is given by $\bar{\mu}_i \in \mathbb{R}$ and the covariance matrix is given by $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$, which is symmetric and positive semi-definite.

The goal is now to maximize the expected return of the portfolio, while the variance of the portfolio does not exceed a certain value V_0 . To ensure that only a reasonable amount of different assets is chosen, we introduce a cardinality constraint according to Jin et al. (2016) of the form

$$\|y\|_0 = |\{i \in \{1, \dots, N\} : y_i > 0\}| \leq k,$$

in which $\|y\|_0$ represents the number of entries of y that are non-zero. This number is bounded from above by a fixed number $k \in N$ with $1 \leq k \leq N$. Consequently, only up to k assets can be included in the portfolio. We can reformulate this constraint with a binary variable s and obtain the nominal cardinality-constrained portfolio optimization problem

$$\max_{y, s} \quad \bar{\mu}^\top y \tag{25a}$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad y^\top \Sigma y \leq V_0, \quad \sum_{i=1}^N y_i = 1, \tag{25b}$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^N s_i \leq k, \quad y_i \leq s_i, \quad i \in \{1, \dots, N\} \tag{25c}$$

$$s \in \{0, 1\}^N, \quad y \geq 0. \tag{25d}$$

4.2. Robust Counterpart with Continuous Budgeted Uncertainty Set. For the uncertain model, we introduce budgeted uncertainties in the expected returns that depend on a second vector of decision-variables $x \in [0, 1]^N$, which is, in contrast to the previous sections, continuous. The variable x_i models the decision whether and in what extent to hedge, i.e., to insure oneself, against the uncertainty in the expected return of asset i , e.g., by acquiring additional information about the asset.

For this, we modify the objective function of Problem (25) to include the costs for hedging $c^\top x$ as well as the uncertainties. We obtain the uncertain portfolio selection problem

$$\max_{y,s,x} \quad \bar{\mu}^\top y - c^\top x - \max_{u \in U_p^{\text{cb}}(x)} \sum_{i=1}^N u_i \hat{\mu}_i y_i \quad (26a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad (25b)-(25d). \quad (26b)$$

Here, the budgeted uncertainty set has the form

$$U_p^{\text{cb}}(x) := \left\{ u \in \mathbb{R}^N : \sum_{i=1}^N u_i \leq \Gamma, 0 \leq u_i \leq 1 - \gamma_i x_i, i \in \{1, \dots, N\} \right\}.$$

If we choose $x_i \in (0, 1]$, we hedge against the uncertainty in the expected returns for asset i . For $x_i = 0$, we do not hedge against the uncertainties for asset i at all. Then again, $\Gamma \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ is called the uncertainty budget and $\gamma_i \in [0, 1]$, $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, is the fraction of uncertainty that will be reduced.

4.2.1. Classic Robust Approach. We start by dualizing the inner maximization problem

$$\max_u \quad \sum_{i=1}^N u_i \hat{\mu}_i y_i \quad (27a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{i=1}^N u_i \leq \Gamma, \quad (27b)$$

$$0 \leq u_i \leq 1 - \gamma_i x_i, \quad i \in \{1, \dots, N\}, \quad (27c)$$

and obtain the dual problem

$$\min_{\lambda, \pi} \quad \pi \Gamma + \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i (1 - \gamma_i x_i) \quad (28a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \lambda_i + \pi \geq \hat{\mu}_i y_i, \quad i \in \{1, \dots, N\}, \quad (28b)$$

$$\pi, \lambda \geq 0. \quad (28c)$$

Using strong duality, we can substitute this result back into the original problem to derive the classic robust single-level reformulation

$$\max_{y,s,x,\pi,\lambda} \quad \bar{\mu}^\top y - c^\top x - \pi \Gamma - \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i (1 - \gamma_i x_i) \quad (29a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad y^\top \Sigma y \leq V_0, \quad \sum_{i=1}^N y_i = 1, \quad (29b)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^N s_i \leq k, \quad y_i \leq s_i, \quad i \in \{1, \dots, N\}, \quad (29c)$$

$$\lambda_i + \pi \geq \hat{\mu}_i y_i, \quad i \in \{1, \dots, N\}, \quad (29d)$$

$$x \in [0, 1]^N, \quad s \in \{0, 1\}^N, \quad y, \pi, \lambda \geq 0. \quad (29e)$$

4.2.2. *Bilevel Approach.* According to Goerigk et al. (2025), we can reformulate the uncertain portfolio optimization problem (26) as a bilevel optimization problem of the form

$$\max_{s,x,y,u} \quad \bar{\mu}^\top y - c^\top x - \sum_{i=1}^N u_i \hat{\mu}_i y_i \quad (30a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad y^\top \Sigma y \leq V_0, \quad \sum_{i=1}^N y_i = 1, \quad (30b)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^N s_i \leq k, \quad y_i \leq s_i, \quad i \in \{1, \dots, N\}, \quad (30c)$$

$$s \in \{0, 1\}^N, \quad x \in [0, 1]^N, \quad y \geq 0, \quad (30d)$$

$$u \in S_p^{\text{cb}}(y, x), \quad (30e)$$

in which $S_p^{\text{cb}}(y, x)$ is the set of optimal solutions to the (y, x) -parameterized lower-level problem (27). Dualizing this lower-level problem again gives us the dual problem (28). Strong duality implies that every pair of primal and dual feasible points is optimal if

$$\sum_{i=1}^N u_i \hat{\mu}_i y_i \geq \pi \Gamma + \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i (1 - \gamma_i x_i)$$

holds. With this, we can reformulate the bilevel problem (30) as

$$\max_{y,s,x,u,\pi,\lambda} \quad \bar{\mu}^\top y - c^\top x - \sum_{i=1}^N u_i \hat{\mu}_i y_i \quad (31a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad y^\top \Sigma y \leq V_0, \quad \sum_{i=1}^N y_i = 1, \quad (31b)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^N s_i \leq k, \quad y_i \leq s_i, \quad i \in \{1, \dots, N\}, \quad (31c)$$

$$\lambda_i + \pi \geq \hat{\mu}_i y_i, \quad i \in \{1, \dots, N\}, \quad (31d)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^N u_i \leq \Gamma, \quad u_i \leq 1 - \gamma_i x_i, \quad i \in \{1, \dots, N\}, \quad (31e)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^N u_i \hat{\mu}_i y_i \geq \pi \Gamma + \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i (1 - \gamma_i x_i), \quad (31f)$$

$$s \in \{0, 1\}^N, \quad x \in [0, 1]^N, \quad y, \pi, \lambda, u \geq 0. \quad (31g)$$

We note that we are not able to exactly reformulate the bilinearities due to the continuity of the variables u, x, y as well as the dual variable λ . A comparison of the derived reformulations w.r.t. the size of the models can be found in Table 4. Again, the bilevel reformulation has more variables and constraints.

4.3. **Robust Counterpart with Discrete Knapsack Uncertainty Set.** We now consider a discrete uncertainty set of the form

$$U_p^{\text{dk}}(x) := \left\{ u \in \{0, 1\}^N : \sum_{i=1}^N f_i u_i \leq b(x) \right\},$$

TABLE 4. Comparison of the model sizes of the reformulations for the uncertain portfolio problem (26) dependent on the number of assets N .

	Robust (29)	Bilevel (31)
Continuous Variables	$3N + 1$	$4N + 1$
Binary variables	N	N
Constraints	$6N + 4$	$8N + 6$

in which $f_i \geq 0$ and $b(x) = b - w^\top x$ holds. This results in the bilevel problem

$$\max_{y, s, x, u} \quad \bar{\mu}^\top y - c^\top x - \sum_{i=n}^N u_i \hat{\mu}_i y_i \quad (32a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad y^\top \Sigma y \leq V_0, \quad \sum_{i=1}^N y_i = 1, \quad (32b)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^N s_i \leq k, \quad y_i \leq s_i, \quad i \in \{1, \dots, N\}, \quad (32c)$$

$$s \in \{0, 1\}^N, \quad x \in [0, 1]^N, \quad y \geq 0, \quad (32d)$$

$$u \in S_p^{\text{dk}}(y, x), \quad (32e)$$

where $S_p^{\text{dk}}(y, x)$ is the set of optimal solutions to the (y, x) -parameterized lower-level problem

$$\begin{aligned} \max_u \quad & \sum_{i=n}^N u_i \hat{\mu}_i y_i \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{i=1}^N f_i u_i \leq b(x), \\ & u_i \in \{0, 1\}, \quad i \in \{1, \dots, n\}. \end{aligned}$$

Due to the binary structure of the lower-level variable u , we can now reformulate the bilinearity $u^\top y$ in the objective function with the help of McCormick inequalities in the lower-level problem. Nevertheless, this also keeps us from deriving the classic robust single-level reformulation, since no dualization is possible.

However, solving Problem (31) is also challenging from a bilevel point of view due to at least the following two reasons. First, in contrast to the previous sections, the linking variables, i.e., the upper-level variables that enter the lower-level, are continuous and not discrete. To the best of our knowledge, for this class of bilevel problems, containing continuous linking variables and integer lower-level variables, no general-purpose approaches are known so far. Consequently, none of today's bilevel solvers can handle this problem class. From a robust point of view, these linking variables are the ones on which the uncertainty set depends on. The second reason that makes Problem (32) challenging to solve is that the upper-level contains a quadratic constraint. Again, we are not aware of any solver for this kind of MIQP-MILP bilevel problems. Consequently, we will not present numerical results for this model.

TABLE 5. Outline of the Computational Study.

	Uncertainty Set		
	Budgeted	Continuous Knapsack	Binary Knapsack
Shortest Path	Sect. 5.1.1	—	Sect. 5.3.1
Knapsack	Sect. 5.1.2	Sect. 5.2	Sect. 5.3.2
Portfolio Selection	Sect. 5.1.3	—	—

5. COMPUTATIONAL STUDY

In the computational study, we consider the decision-dependent robust versions of the shortest path problem, the knapsack problem, and the portfolio selection problem as described in the previous sections. We start with continuous uncertainty sets that can be tackled both by the classic (duality-based) robust approach and by the bilevel reformulations. More precisely, this corresponds to a budgeted uncertainty set for all three applications and a continuous knapsack uncertainty set, see Poss (2013), for the knapsack problem. The goal is to compare the computational performance of robust and bilevel approaches w.r.t. runtimes and branch-and-bound nodes. As a second part of the computational study, we consider the binary knapsack uncertainty set for the shortest path problem and the knapsack problem. For these two applications, we report numerical results based on the bilevel reformulation described in Section 2.3 and Section 3.4 using the mixed-integer bilevel solver MibS 1.2.0, which internally uses the mixed-integer linear optimization solver CPLEX 22.1.1. A detailed outline of the following computational study is given by Table 5.

The single-level reformulations were implemented in Python 3.12.2 using Gurobi 11.0.3 through its `gurobipy` interface. Our open-source implementations and all instances used in this computational study are publicly available at <https://github.com/simstevens/ddro-via-bilevel>. All experiments were conducted on a single core Intel Xeon Gold 6126 at 2.6 GHz with 64 GB of RAM and with a time limit of 2 h.

5.1. Budgeted Uncertainty Set. In this section, we consider all three applications with their respective decision-dependent budgeted uncertainty set. We compare the robust approach with the bilevel approach. Note that we do not report numerical results for the bilevel approach based on the KKT reformulation because preliminary experiments revealed that the strong-duality-based model always outperforms the KKT-based one. Hence, the bilevel approaches correspond to Model (9) for the shortest path problem, Model (20) for the knapsack problem, and Model (31) for the portfolio selection problem. The robust approaches correspond to Model (7) for the shortest path problem, Model (17) for the knapsack problem, and Model (29) for the portfolio selection problem.

5.1.1. The Shortest Path Problem.

Instances. We randomly generate instances as in Nohadani and Sharma (2018). To this end, the number of nodes is taken as input. Initially, each node is uniformly associated to a point on a 100×100 grid to define travel costs between two nodes by their Euclidean distance. Then, the source and the target nodes are chosen to be the two furthest nodes in the respective complete graph. To avoid direct connections between the source and the target, we then remove 60% of the longest arcs. Hence, we obtain a graph $G = (V, A)$ with $|A| = |V| \times (|V| - 1) \times 0.4$ arcs. The cost to reduce uncertainty is assumed to be the same for all arcs and was fixed to $c_a = 1$. Finally, the maximum deviation of the travel costs \hat{d}_a is set to the nominal value \bar{d}_a ,




FIGURE 1. ECDF of computation time (for the entire test set) and branch-and-bound nodes (only for instances solved by both approaches within the time limit) for the shortest path problem with budgeted uncertainty set. Solid blue: bilevel approach. Dashed orange: robust approach.

i.e., we allow for a maximum deviation of 100%. We use an uncertainty budget Γ equal to 2 while the fraction of uncertainty reduction γ_a is set to 0.2 for all arcs a . We consider instances with a number of nodes $|V|$ ranging from 50 to 300 with a step size of 25. For each instance size, 20 instances are generated to obtain 220 instances in total.

Results. For a time limit of 2 hours, the left plot of Figure 1 depicts the empirical cumulative distribution function (ECDF) of computation times regarding all instances from the test set. The right plot shows the ECDF of the number of branch-and-bound nodes, considering only instances that were solved by both approaches within the time limit. For unsolved instances, the number of necessary branch-and-bound nodes is unknown. Consequently, we cannot draw a final conclusion for these instances regarding the necessary branch-and-bound nodes. However, for sake of completeness we also include the corresponding ECDF plots for all instances in Appendix B.

It can be seen that the robust approach clearly outperforms the bilevel approach in terms of computation time. Indeed, while 84.1% of the instances are solved in less than 30 minutes by the robust approach, only 57.3% of the test set can be solved by the bilevel approach in the same amount of time. Moreover, the robust approach solves 95.0% of the test set within the time limit while the bilevel approach is only able to solve 78.2%. Regarding the number of branch-and-bound nodes, the ECDF on the right of Figure 1 shows that both models tend to produce search trees of similar size, with slightly smaller trees for the bilevel approach. The bilevel approach solves larger problems at each node of the branch-and-bound tree, which requires more time compared to the robust approach. Indeed, the bilevel approach considers both the primal and the dual part of the inner optimization problem at each node, while the robust approach only includes the dual part of the problem.

Figure 2 gives a more detailed overview of computation times depending on the size of the instances. Here, we see that increasing the size of the instances drastically impacts the bilevel approach. More precisely, using the bilevel approach only 3 instances with 300 nodes are solved while the robust approach is still able to




FIGURE 2. Scatter plot of computation times with the number of solved instances (out of 20 each) for the shortest path problem with budgeted uncertainty set. Blue dots: bilevel approach. Orange diamonds: robust approach.

solve 13 of them. Moreover, the decrease in the number of solved instances within the time limit is much steeper for the bilevel approach than for the robust approach.

Conclusion. For the uncertain shortest path problem, the experiments show that the robust approach based on dualization outperforms the bilevel approach based on the strong duality reformulation in terms of computation time. Further, both approaches explore branch-and-bound trees of similar sizes. This can be understood by the larger size of the models in the bilevel approach w.r.t. those in the robust approach while producing only a marginal improvement on the dual bound.

5.1.2. The Knapsack Problem.

Instances. We randomly generate instances using the knapsack instance generator `gen2` by Martello et al. (1999) with strongly correlated weights ranging between 1 and 100. The knapsack capacity is set to $0.35W_{\text{sum}}$ with W_{sum} being the sum of the weights of the items. For each item i , the hedging cost h_i is uniformly drawn from the interval $[c_i/10, c_i/5]$. The uncertainty budget Γ is fixed to $n/100$ while the uncertainty reduction γ_i is set to 0.2 for all items. The maximum weight deviation of an item \hat{a}_i is set to 10% of its nominal weight. We consider instances with a number of items n taking values 1000, 2000, ..., 10000. For every instance size, we generate 20 instances, thus producing 200 instances in total.

Results. For a time limit of 2 hours, Figure 3 depicts the ECDF of computation times and the number of branch-and-bound nodes of both approaches. We observe that the robust approach significantly outperforms the bilevel approach in terms of computation time. For instance, the robust approach is able to solve 94.5% of the instances within 15 minutes while the bilevel approach cannot solve more than 42.0% of the instances within the same time. However, we also see that not many more instances are solved by the robust approach in the remaining time (1 hour 45 minutes). This seems to indicate rather large branch-and-bound trees and weak bounds during the search. Nevertheless, we also see from the ECDF on the right of Figure 3, representing the number of branch-and-bound nodes for all instances solved by both approaches within the time limit, that the two approaches again lead




FIGURE 3. ECDF of computation time (for the entire test set) and branch-and-bound nodes (only for instances solved by both approaches within the time limit) for the knapsack problem with budgeted uncertainty set. Solid blue: bilevel approach. Dashed orange: robust approach.

to similar search tree sizes. Interestingly, we also see that approximately 15% of the instances are solved without any branching by both approaches. We again refer to the Appendix B for the plot of the number of branch-and-bound nodes regarding all instances.

Figure 4 gives a more detailed overview of computation times as a function of the number of items. We see that instances with 4000 to 6000 items seem to be the most challenging for the bilevel approach. However, the robust approach does not seem to be very sensitive to the number of items. We also see that the bilevel approach is significantly outperformed by the robust approach on some instance sizes. For instance, while the robust approach solves all instances with 5000 items in less than half an hour, the bilevel approach is able to solve only 5 out of 20 within the time limit of two hours.

Conclusion. For the robust knapsack problem, the experiments show that the robust approach significantly outperforms the bilevel approach in terms of computation time and both approaches produce exploration trees of similar size during the branch-and-bound search.

5.1.3. The Portfolio Selection Problem.

Instances. We randomly generate instances as follows. The covariance matrix Σ and the vector of nominal expected returns $\bar{\mu}$ are generated using the instance generator from Pardalos and Rodgers (1990) with the default settings. The maximum variance V_0 is uniformly drawn from $[\sigma_{\text{mean}}, \sigma_{\text{max}}]$ with σ_{mean} the arithmetic mean of all entries in Σ and σ_{max} the maximum entry of Σ . The cardinality parameter k is set to 10. The uncertainty set is defined by setting Γ to 20 and $\gamma_i = 0.2$ for all assets i . The maximum return deviation $\hat{\mu}_i$ for asset i is uniformly drawn from $[\bar{\mu}/2, \bar{\mu}]$ while the hedging cost against uncertainty c_i is uniformly taken from $[\bar{\mu}/10, \bar{\mu}/5]$. We consider instances with N many assets for which N takes the values 50, 100, \dots , 500. For each instance size, we generate 20 instances resulting in 180 instances.




FIGURE 4. Scatter plot of computation times with the number of solved instances (out of 20 each) for the knapsack problem with budgeted uncertainty set. Blue dots: bilevel approach. Orange diamonds: robust approach.




FIGURE 5. ECDF of computation time (for the entire test set) and branch-and-bound nodes (only for instances solved by both approaches) for the portfolio selection problem with budgeted uncertainty set. Solid blue: bilevel approach. Dashed orange: robust approach.

Results. In Figure 5, we depict the ECDF of computation time and of the number of nodes in the branch-and-bound tree for both approaches. Here again, we see that the robust approach strongly outperforms the bilevel approach when it comes to computation time. The right side of the figure regards the number of nodes in the branch-and-bound tree during the search considering the instances solved by both approaches within the time limit. There, the results show that both approaches have a comparable branch-and-bound tree size with slightly smaller trees for the bilevel approach. The corresponding plot of the number of branch-and-bound nodes regarding all instances can be found in the Appendix B.




FIGURE 6. Scatter plot of computation times with the number of solved instances (out of 20 each) for the portfolio selection problem with budgeted uncertainty set. Blue dots: bilevel approach. Orange diamonds: robust approach.

Figure 6 reports the computation time of both approaches depending on the number of assets. From that figure, it is clear that the size of the instance plays a crucial role in the performance of the methods. For instance, while the bilevel approach can solve 17 out of 20 instances with 200 assets within the time limit, it can only solve 3 of them with 250 assets and none of the instances with 300 assets. A similar behavior can be observed for the robust approach, which can solve slightly larger instances. Indeed, while 15 instances with 250 assets can be solved within two hours, roughly half of them can be solved with 300 assets and only one instance with 350 assets can be solved within the time limit. Nevertheless, we point out that the robust approach is still able to solve some instances (2 out of 20) with up to 500 assets.

Conclusion. The robust approach is able to solve more instances than the bilevel approach and within a smaller amount of time. It also shows that both approaches are very sensitive to the size of the instance as it is typically the case for nonconvex optimization problems. Indeed, for this application, products of variables cannot be exactly linearized and require, e.g., spatial branching techniques to be dealt with. This is in contrast to the shortest path and the knapsack problem, which involve products of binary and bounded continuous variables that can be linearized using standard reformulation techniques.

5.2. Continuous Knapsack Uncertainty Set. We now consider the knapsack problem with the continuous knapsack uncertainty set introduced by Poss (2013). For this application, we compare the robust approach, i.e., Model (17), with the bilevel approach, i.e., Model (20). Contrary to the previous section, we recall that these models do not explicitly consider hedging decisions against uncertainty but are stated in the original space of the deterministic problem.

Instances. We randomly generate instances using the knapsack instance generator `gen2` by Martello et al. (1999) with strongly correlated weights ranging between 1 and 100. For each number of items n in $\{1000, 2000, \dots, 10\,000\}$, we produce 20 instances indexed by $k \in \{1, \dots, 20\}$. For the k th instance, the capacity of the




FIGURE 7. ECDF of computation times (for the entire test set) and branch-and-bound nodes (only for instances solved by both approaches within in the time limit) for the knapsack problem with continuous knapsack uncertainty set. Solid blue: bilevel approach. Dashed orange: robust approach.

knapsack and that of the uncertainty set is set to

$$\max \left\{ \frac{W_{\text{sum}}}{k}, \max_{i=1, \dots, n} w_i \right\}.$$

The maximum weight deviation \hat{a}_i is set to 10% of the nominal weight \bar{a}_i . In total, our test set contains 200 instances.

Results. In Figure 7, we depict the ECDF of computation time and number of nodes in the branch-and-bound tree for both approaches. We see that the robust and the bilevel approach have a similar performance both in terms of computation time and in terms of branch-and-bound nodes. We note, however, a small advantage for the robust approach, which is able to solve one instance more than the bilevel approach within the time limit of two hours. This is confirmed by Figure 8 which gives a more detailed overview of computation times depending on the number of items. We also see that the continuous uncertainty set leads to empirically harder problems than the budgeted uncertainty set from the previous section. Indeed, while all instances with 10 000 items could be solved by the robust approach with the budgeted uncertainty set, only 3 out of 20 could be solved with the continuous knapsack uncertainty set.

In Figure 9, a heatmap putting in relation the number of items, the knapsack's capacity and the computation time is presented. We see that both approaches struggle to solve the same class of instances. In particular, instances with a capacity which is around 50% of the sum of the weights seem to be the most challenging ones. This fact was already stated by Pisinger (2005). Obviously, larger instances also tend to be more difficult to solve than smaller ones.

Conclusion. The experiments show that both approaches have similar performances with a small advantage in favor of the robust approach. We also see that hard instances are the same in both cases and correspond to larger instances with a capacity around 50% of the sum of the weights.




FIGURE 8. Scatter plot of computation times with the number of solved instances for the knapsack problem with continuous knapsack uncertainty set. Blue dots: bilevel approach. Orange diamonds: robust approach.




FIGURE 9. Heatmap of the computation times depending on the knapsacks capacity for the knapsack problem with continuous knapsack uncertainty set.

5.3. Discrete Knapsack Uncertainty Set. In the two previous sections, we considered continuous uncertainty sets to which both standard techniques from robust and bilevel optimization can be applied. In this section, we focus on a discrete uncertainty set for which, to the best of our knowledge, no computational method has been introduced in the literature on robust optimization. Hence, we report the first numerical results for this class of problems based on the bilevel reformulation presented in Sections 2.3 and 3.4. In these two cases, we solve the mixed-integer bilevel formulation with MibS. As discussed in Appendix A, the linearization of the

products of binary variables in the bilevel problems can be realized using either continuous or binary auxiliary variables. Since neither of the two approaches showed significant advantages over the other, we only present the results for binary auxiliary variables. We cannot report numerical results on the portfolio selection problem with discrete knapsack uncertainty because the bilevel solver MibS requires that all constraints are linear.

5.3.1. The Shortest Path Problem.

Instances. The instances are randomly generated similar to the procedure of Section 5.1.1 with the following minor modifications. To obtain smaller, connected graphs, we remove 20% of the longest arcs in the complete graph instead of 60% in the budgeted uncertainty case and consider instances with a number of nodes ranging from 2 to 10 with a step size of 1. The uncertainty set is generated using the knapsack instance generator `gen2` from Martello et al. (1999) with uncorrelated weights ranging from 1 to 100. Given a randomly generated knapsack instance, we use the same weights to define the uncertainty set, i.e., vector f . Then, the decision-dependent right-hand side $b(x)$ is generated as follows. First, the constant term b is fixed to $0.1W_{\text{sum}}$ with W_{sum} being the sum of all weights. Then, each linear coefficient w_i is uniformly drawn from $[0, b/|V|]$ to ensure that $b(x) \geq 0$ for all $x \in \{0, 1\}^{|A|}$. As in Section 5.1.1, the cost to reduce uncertainty is assumed to be the same for all arcs and is fixed to $c_a = 1$. Finally, the maximum deviation for the costs, \hat{d}_a , is set to the nominal value \bar{d}_a , i.e., we allow for a maximum deviation of 100%.

Results. In Figure 10, we report the computation time of the instances which could be solved within the time limit as well as the number of such instances. Arguably, the discrete uncertainty version is much more challenging to solve than its continuous counterpart. Let us recall that much smaller instances are considered (up to 10 nodes vs. up to 300 nodes). Moreover, the computation time is much more affected by the size of the instances. Indeed, let us highlight that Figure 10 has a log-scaled y -axis while that of Figure 2 is linear. Moreover, the step size of the x -axis is 1, while it was of 25 for the latter. All in all, we see that MibS is “only” able to solve 2 out of 20 instances with 7 nodes within the time limit while both the robust and bilevel approach can solve 19 out of 20 instances with 50 nodes in less than 22 seconds in the case of the continuous uncertainty case.

While the size of the solved instances may seem to be very small, we highlight that both the number of variables and constraints are in the order of $|V|^2$. For instance, the largest instances which can be solved within the time limit have “only” 7 nodes but have 68 upper- and lower-level variables and 14 and 103 upper- and lower-level constraints, respectively. We recall that the large number of constraints in the lower level are due to the McCormick inequalities used to linearize the products between the upper- and the lower-level variables.

5.3.2. The Knapsack Problem.

Instances. The instances are randomly generated using the `gen2` instance generator from Martello et al. (1999) with uncorrelated weights ranging from 1 to 100. To this end, two knapsack instances are generated and used to define the deterministic knapsack instance and the uncertainty set weights. Both capacities are set to $0.1W_{\text{sum}}$ with W_{sum} being the sum of the weights in the corresponding knapsack. The number of items varies from 50 to 130 with a step size of 10. For each size, we generate 20 instances leading to 180 instances overall.




FIGURE 10. Scatter plot of computation times of each solved instances, its average (dashed line), and the number of solved instances for the shortest path problem with the knapsack uncertainty set. The y -axis is log-scaled.

Results. In Figure 11, we report the computation time of the instances which could be solved within the time limit (2h) as well as the number of such instances. Here again, we see that the discrete uncertainty version is considerably harder to solve than its continuous counterpart. This fact is easily demonstrated by the size of the instances considered. Indeed, while the experiments with the continuous knapsack uncertainty set were performed with instances with up to 10 000 items, up to 130 items instances are considered here. Yet, none of the instances with 130 items could be solved within the time limit using MibS. We also see that this approach is highly sensitive to the size of the instance since 15 out of the 20 instances with 100 items could be solved within the time limit while only 3 instances with 110 items could be solved within the same time.

We also note that the largest instance which can be solved within the time limit has 120 items. The corresponding bilevel model has 120 upper- and lower-level variables, a single upper-level constraint and 361 lower-level constraints. In that regard, the decision-dependent robust knapsack problem with discrete knapsack uncertainty set seems to be substantially easier to solve compared to the decision-dependent robust shortest path problem with the same uncertainty set.

6. CONCLUSION

Bilevel and robust optimization problems have a rather similar mathematical structure. However, only until recently, these similarities have not been studied and the two respective communities have not been in scientific contact a lot. While the connection has been, to the best of our knowledge, observed by Stein (2013) in the context of (generalized) semi-infinite optimization, the first systematic analysis of the structural similarities and differences has only recently been published by Goerigk et al. (2025).

Using the results from the mentioned paper, here we are the first actually exploiting the equivalence of decision-dependent robust optimization and bilevel optimization in a computational study. First, we consider different classic robust optimization problems with decision-dependent uncertainty sets, which are given in a continuous and convex way so that classic dualization tricks of robust optimization




FIGURE 11. Scatter plot of computation times of each solved instance, its average (dashed line), and the number of solved instances for the knapsack problem with the discrete knapsack uncertainty set. The y -axis is log-scaled.

can be applied. In these cases, the respective single-level reformulations of the corresponding bilevel problems are similar but larger, which leads to larger computation times but in some cases may also slightly improve the quality of the relaxations w.r.t. the dual bounds. Second, we also consider decision-dependent uncertainty sets that cannot be treated via dualization because they are represented as mixed-integer linear problems, for which no strong-duality theorem is available in general. To the best of our knowledge, there are no general-purpose approaches in the robust optimization literature to tackle such problems. However, the bilevel reformulation by Goerigk et al. (2025) together with recent advances in mixed-integer linear bilevel optimization can be used to solve these problems. In this paper, we present the first computational analysis for this approach. While this novel possibility of solving robust problems is a contribution on its own, our numerical results clearly show that only small-scale decision-dependent robust problems can be solved. Hence, there is quite some room for future research at the interface of robust and bilevel optimization. We hope that this paper paves the way for such future contributions.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We acknowledge the support by the German Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung within the project “RODES” (Förderkennzeichen 05M22UTB).

The computations were executed on the high performance cluster “Elwetritsch” at the TU Kaiserslautern, which is part of the “Alliance of High Performance Computing Rheinland-Pfalz” (AHRP). We kindly acknowledge the support of RHRK.

The authors acknowledge the use of DeepL and OpenAI’s ChatGPT for partly editing and polishing the text and figures for spelling, grammar, and stylistic improvements. Additionally, ChatGPT was utilized for support in basic coding tasks.

APPENDIX A.

We now show that we can equivalently linearize products of binary variables in the lower and upper-level of a given bilevel problem using McCormick inequalities (McCormick 1976). To this end, we denote the element-wise (or Hadamard) product

of two vectors $x, u \in \{0, 1\}^n$ by $(x \circ u)_i = x_i u_i$, $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. We then consider the bilevel problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{x, u} \quad & c^\top x \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & a^\top x + b^\top (x \circ u) \leq d_u, \\ & x \in \{0, 1\}^n, \\ & u \in S(x), \end{aligned}$$

where $S(x)$ is the set of optimal solutions to the x -parameterized lower-level problem

$$\min_u \quad -b^\top (x \circ u) \quad (33a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad Cx + Du \leq d_l, \quad (33b)$$

$$u \in \{0, 1\}^n. \quad (33c)$$

To linearize the bilinear terms “ $x \circ u$ ” we use the McCormick inequalities

$$-u_i + r_i^u \leq 0, \quad -x_i + r_i^u \leq 0, \quad x_i + u_i - r_i^u \leq 1, \quad i \in \{1, \dots, n\}, \quad (34a)$$

$$-u_i + r_i^l \leq 0, \quad -x_i + r_i^l \leq 0, \quad x_i + u_i - r_i^l \leq 1, \quad i \in \{1, \dots, n\}. \quad (34b)$$

Here, $r^u \in \{0, 1\}^n$ is the auxiliary variable for the upper-level problem and $r^l \in \{0, 1\}^n$ is the auxiliary variable for the lower-level problem and $r_i^l = r_i^u = x_i u_i$, $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, holds by construction. Note, that the auxiliary variables can also be chosen continuously. However, none of the approaches showed a significant advantage in terms of runtime. Thus, we will only state the derivation and the results for the binary case.

Using these McCormick inequalities (34), we obtain the bilevel problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{x, u, r^u, r^l} \quad & c^\top x \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & a^\top x + b^\top r^u \leq d_u, \\ & (34a), \quad x, r^u \in \{0, 1\}^n, \\ & (u, r^l) \in S(x), \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

where $S(x)$ is the set of optimal solutions to the x -parameterized lower-level problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{u, r^l} \quad & -b^\top r^l \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & Cx + Du \leq d_l, \\ & (34b), \quad u, r^l \in \{0, 1\}^n. \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

We can now show that this problem is equivalent to the following one in which the McCormick inequalities are only in the lower-level problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{x, u, r^l} \quad & c^\top x \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & a^\top x + b^\top r^l \leq d_u, \\ & x \in \{0, 1\}^n, \quad (u, r^l) \in S(x). \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

Here, $S(x)$ is the set of optimal solutions to the x -parameterized lower-level problem (36).

Lemma 1. *For every bilevel-feasible point (x, r^u, u, r^l) of Problem (35), the point (x, u, r^l) is bilevel-feasible for Problem (37) with the same objective function value. Moreover, for every bilevel-feasible point (x, u, r^l) of Problem (37), the point (x, r^l, u, r^l) is bilevel-feasible for Problem (35) with the same objective function value.*

Proof. Let (x, u, r^l) be bilevel-feasible for Problem (37). Then, (x, r^l, u, r^l) satisfies the upper- and lower-level constraints of Problem (35). The point (u, r^l) is optimal for the lower-level problem (36) due to the bilevel-feasibility of (x, u, r^l) .

Let now (x, r^u, u, r^l) be bilevel-feasible for Problem (35). Then, (x, u, r^l) satisfies the upper- and lower-level constraints of Problem (37) since $r^l = r^u$ by construction of the McCormick inequalities. The point (u, r^l) is optimal for the lower-level problem (36) due to the bilevel-feasibility of (x, r^u, u, r^l) .

We finally note that Problems (35) and (37) have the same objective functions, which proves the claim. \square

We note that it is w.l.o.g. to assume that the uncertainties and, thus, the auxiliary variables for the McCormick uncertainties are exclusively in the constraints. For uncertainties in the objective function we can always use the epigraph reformulation.

As a result of the presented reformulation, we obtain a mixed-integer linear bilevel problem (37) that can be directly solved by state-of-the-art bilevel solvers. Consequently, we can reformulate the bilevel problems in Section 2.3 and 3.4 as problems that can be tackled by the MibS solver.

Remark 1. *Since the proof of Lemma 1 does not depend on the structure of the upper-level non-coupling constraints, it stays valid if (non-)linear non-coupling constraints are added to the upper-level. However, there is no solver available for such nonlinear bilevel problems.*

Remark 2. *Lemma 1 also holds for any finitely bounded continuous lower-level variable $u_i \in [0, u_i^+]$ and the corresponding McCormick inequalities. Since the lower-level problem (33) would then be a continuous linear problem, the bilevel problem can be reformulated as a single-level problem using the KKT conditions or strong duality.*

APPENDIX B.




FIGURE 12. ECDF of branch-and-bound nodes over the entire test set for all models with continuous uncertainty sets. Solid blue: bilevel approach. Dashed orange: robust approach.

REFERENCES

- Aigner, K.-M., J.-P. Clarner, F. Liers, and A. Martin (2022). “Robust approximation of chance constrained DC optimal power flow under decision-dependent uncertainty.” In: *European Journal of Operational Research* 301.1, pp. 318–333. DOI: [10.1016/j.ejor.2021.10.051](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2021.10.051).
- Apap, R. M. and I. E. Grossmann (2017). “Models and computational strategies for multistage stochastic programming under endogenous and exogenous uncertainties.” In: *Computers & Chemical Engineering* 103, pp. 233–274. DOI: [10.1016/j.compchemeng.2016.11.011](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compchemeng.2016.11.011).
- Avraamidou, S. and E. N. Pistikopoulos (2020). “Adjustable robust optimization through multi-parametric programming.” In: *Optimization Letters* 14.4, pp. 873–887. DOI: [10.1007/s11590-019-01438-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11590-019-01438-5).

- Basciftci, B., S. Ahmed, and S. Shen (2021). “Distributionally robust facility location problem under decision-dependent stochastic demand.” In: *European Journal of Operational Research* 292.2, pp. 548–561. DOI: [10.1016/j.ejor.2020.11.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2020.11.002).
- Beck, Y., I. Ljubić, and M. Schmidt (2023). “A Survey on Bilevel Optimization Under Uncertainty.” In: *European Journal on Operational Research*. DOI: [10.1016/j.ejor.2023.01.008](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2023.01.008).
- Ben-Tal, A., L. El Ghaoui, and A. Nemirovski (2009). *Robust Optimization*. Princeton Series in Applied Mathematics. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, pp. xxii+542. DOI: [10.1515/9781400831050](https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400831050).
- Ben-Tal, A. and A. Nemirovski (1999). “Robust solutions of uncertain linear programs.” In: *Operations Research Letters* 25.1, pp. 1–13. DOI: [10.1016/S0167-6377\(99\)00016-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-6377(99)00016-4).
- Bertsimas, D., D. B. Brown, and C. Caramanis (2011). “Theory and applications of robust optimization.” In: *SIAM Review* 53.3, pp. 464–501. DOI: [10.1137/080734510](https://doi.org/10.1137/080734510).
- Bertsimas, D. and M. Sim (2003). “Robust discrete optimization and network flows.” In: *Mathematical Programming* 98.1, pp. 49–71. DOI: [10.1007/s10107-003-0396-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10107-003-0396-4).
- Dempe, S. (2002). *Foundations of Bilevel Programming*. Springer US. DOI: [10.1007/b101970](https://doi.org/10.1007/b101970).
- Dempe, S., V. Kalashnikov, G. A. Pérez-Valdés, and N. Kalashnykova (2015). *Bilevel Programming Problems*. Springer. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-662-45827-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-45827-3).
- DeNegre, S. T. and T. K. Ralphs (2009). “A branch-and-cut algorithm for integer bilevel linear programs.” In: *Operations Research and Cyber-Infrastructure*. Springer, pp. 65–78. DOI: [10.1007/978-0-387-88843-9_4](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-88843-9_4).
- DeNegre, S. T., T. K. Ralphs, S. Tahernejad, and Y. Xie (2024). URL: <https://github.com/coin-or/MibS> (visited on 01/31/2025).
- Doan, X. V. (2022). “Distributionally robust optimization under endogenous uncertainty with an application in retrofitting planning.” In: *European Journal of Operational Research* 300.1, pp. 73–84. DOI: [10.1016/j.ejor.2021.07.013](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2021.07.013).
- Feng, W., Y. Feng, and Q. Zhang (2021). “Multistage distributionally robust optimization for integrated production and maintenance scheduling.” In: *AIChE Journal* 67.9, e17329. DOI: [10.1002/aic.17329](https://doi.org/10.1002/aic.17329).
- Goerigk, M., J. Kurtz, M. Schmidt, and J. Thürauf (2025). “Connections between Robust and Bilevel Optimization.” In: *Open Journal of Mathematical Optimization* 6, 2, pp. 1–17. DOI: [10.5802/ojmo.38](https://doi.org/10.5802/ojmo.38).
- Hellemo, L., P. I. Barton, and A. Tomasgard (2018). “Decision-dependent probabilities in stochastic programs with recourse.” In: *Computational Management Science* 15.3, pp. 369–395. DOI: [10.1007/s10287-018-0330-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10287-018-0330-0).
- Jin, Y., R. Qu, and J. Atkin (2016). “Constrained portfolio optimisation: The state-of-the-art Markowitz models.” In: *International Conference on Operations Research and Enterprise Systems*. Vol. 2, pp. 388–395. DOI: [10.5220/0005758303880395](https://doi.org/10.5220/0005758303880395).
- Jonsbråten, T. W., R. J. Wets, and D. L. Woodruff (1998). “A class of stochastic programs with decision dependent random elements.” In: *Annals of Operations Research* 82, pp. 83–106. DOI: [10.1023/A:1018943626786](https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1018943626786).
- Kleinert, T., M. Labbé, I. Ljubić, and M. Schmidt (2021). “A survey on mixed-integer programming techniques in bilevel optimization.” In: *EURO Journal on Computational Optimization* 9, p. 100007. DOI: [10.1016/j.ejco.2021.100007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejco.2021.100007).
- Lappas, N. H. and C. E. Gounaris (2016). “Multi-stage adjustable robust optimization for process scheduling under uncertainty.” In: *AIChE Journal* 62.5, pp. 1646–1667. DOI: [10.1002/aic.15183](https://doi.org/10.1002/aic.15183).

- Leyffer, S., M. Menickelly, T. Munson, C. Vanaret, and S. M. Wild (2020). “A survey of nonlinear robust optimization.” In: *INFOR: Information Systems and Operational Research* 58.2, pp. 342–373. DOI: [10.1080/03155986.2020.1730676](https://doi.org/10.1080/03155986.2020.1730676).
- Luo, F. and S. Mehrotra (2020). “Distributionally robust optimization with decision dependent ambiguity sets.” In: *Optimization Letters* 14.8, pp. 2565–2594. DOI: [10.1007/s11590-020-01574-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11590-020-01574-3).
- Martello, S., D. Pisinger, and P. Toth (1999). “Dynamic Programming and Strong Bounds for the 0-1 Knapsack Problem.” In: *Management Science* 45.3, pp. 414–424. DOI: [10.1287/mnsc.45.3.414](https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.45.3.414).
- McCormick, G. P. (1976). “Computability of global solutions to factorable non-convex programs: Part I—Convex underestimating problems.” In: *Mathematical Programming* 10.1, pp. 147–175. DOI: [10.1007/BF01580665](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01580665).
- Motamed Nasab, F. and Z. Li (2021). “Multistage adaptive stochastic mixed integer optimization under endogenous and exogenous uncertainty.” In: *AIChE Journal* 67.10, e17333. DOI: [10.1002/aic.17333](https://doi.org/10.1002/aic.17333).
- Nohadani, O. and K. Sharma (2018). “Optimization under decision-dependent uncertainty.” In: *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 28.2, pp. 1773–1795. DOI: [10.1137/17M1110560](https://doi.org/10.1137/17M1110560).
- Pardalos, P. M. and G. P. Rodgers (1990). “Computational aspects of a branch and bound algorithm for quadratic zero-one programming.” In: *Computing* 45.2, pp. 131–144. DOI: [10.1007/BF02247879](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02247879).
- Pisinger, D. (2005). “Where are the hard knapsack problems?” In: *Computers & Operations Research* 32.9, pp. 2271–2284. DOI: [10.1016/j.cor.2004.03.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cor.2004.03.002).
- Poss, M. (2013). “Robust combinatorial optimization with variable budgeted uncertainty.” In: *4OR* 11, pp. 75–92. DOI: [10.1007/s10288-012-0217-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10288-012-0217-9).
- (2014). “Robust combinatorial optimization with variable cost uncertainty.” In: *European Journal of Operational Research* 237.3, pp. 836–845. DOI: [10.1016/j.ejor.2014.02.060](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2014.02.060).
- Ryu, M. and R. Jiang (2025). “Nurse staffing under absenteeism: A distributionally robust optimization approach.” In: *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management*. DOI: [10.1287/msom.2023.0398](https://doi.org/10.1287/msom.2023.0398).
- Soyster, A. L. (1973). “Convex programming with set-inclusive constraints and applications to inexact linear programming.” In: *Operations Research* 21.5, pp. 1154–1157. DOI: [10.1287/opre.21.5.1154](https://doi.org/10.1287/opre.21.5.1154).
- Spacey, S. A., W. Wiesemann, D. Kuhn, and W. Luk (2012). “Robust software partitioning with multiple instantiation.” In: *INFORMS Journal on Computing* 24.3, pp. 500–515. DOI: [10.1287/ijoc.1110.0467](https://doi.org/10.1287/ijoc.1110.0467).
- Stein, O. (2013). *Bi-Level Strategies in Semi-Infinite Programming*. Springer New York, NY. DOI: [10.1007/978-1-4419-9164-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-9164-5).
- Tahernejad, S. and T. K. Ralphs (2020). *Valid Inequalities for Mixed Integer Bilevel Linear Optimization Problems*. URL: <https://coral.ise.lehigh.edu/~ted/files/papers/MibSCuts20>.
- Vujanic, R., P. Goulart, and M. Morari (2016). “Robust optimization of schedules affected by uncertain events.” In: *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications* 171, pp. 1033–1054. DOI: [10.1007/s10957-016-0920-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10957-016-0920-3).
- Yanikoğlu, I., B. L. Gorissen, and D. den Hertog (2019). “A survey of adjustable robust optimization.” In: *European Journal of Operational Research* 277.3, pp. 799–813. DOI: [10.1016/j.ejor.2018.08.031](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2018.08.031).
- Yu, X. and S. Shen (2022). “Multistage distributionally robust mixed-integer programming with decision-dependent moment-based ambiguity sets.” In: *Mathematical Programming* 196.1, pp. 1025–1064. DOI: [10.1007/s10107-020-01580-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10107-020-01580-4).

- Zeng, B. and W. Wang (2022). *Two-stage robust optimization with decision dependent uncertainty*. DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.2203.16484](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2203.16484).
- Zhan, Y., Q. P. Zheng, J. Wang, and P. Pinson (2016). “Generation expansion planning with large amounts of wind power via decision-dependent stochastic programming.” In: *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems* 32.4, pp. 3015–3026. DOI: [10.1109/TPWRS.2016.2626958](https://doi.org/10.1109/TPWRS.2016.2626958).
- Zhang, Q. and W. Feng (2020). “A unified framework for adjustable robust optimization with endogenous uncertainty.” In: *AIChE journal* 66.12, e17047. DOI: [10.1002/aic.17047](https://doi.org/10.1002/aic.17047).
- Zhu, T., J. Xie, and M. Sim (2022). “Joint estimation and robustness optimization.” In: *Management Science* 68.3, pp. 1659–1677. DOI: [10.1287/mnsc.2020.3898](https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2020.3898).
- (H. Lefebvre, M. Schmidt, S. Stevens) TRIER UNIVERSITY, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITÄTSRING 15, 54296 TRIER, GERMANY
Email address: henri.lefebvre@uni-trier.de
Email address: martin.schmidt@uni-trier.de
Email address: stevens@uni-trier.de
- (J. Thürauf) UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY NUREMBERG (UTN), DEPARTMENT LIBERAL ARTS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES, DISCRETE OPTIMIZATION LAB, DR.-LUISE-HERZBERG-STR. 4, 90461 NUREMBERG, GERMANY
Email address: johannes.thuerauf@utn.de