Resilience Analysis of Multi-modal Logistics Service Network Through Robust Optimization with Budget-of-Uncertainty

Yaxin Pang*, Shenle Pan*, Eric Ballot*

* Mines Paris, PSL University, Centre for management science (CGS), i3 UMR9217 CNRS, 75006 Paris, France (e-mail: yaxin.pang@minesparis.psl.eu; shenle.pan@minesparis.psl.eu; eric.ballot@minesparis.psl.eu)

Abstract: Supply chain resilience analysis aims to identify the critical elements in the supply chain, measure its reliability, and analyze solutions for improving vulnerabilities. While extensive methods like stochastic approaches have been dominant, robust optimization—widely applied in robust planning under uncertainties without specific probability distributions—remains relatively underexplored for this research problem. This paper employs robust optimization with budget-of-uncertainty as a tool to analyze the resilience of multi-modal logistics service networks under time uncertainty. We examine the interactive effects of three critical factors: network size, disruption scale, disruption degree. The computational experiments offer valuable managerial insights for practitioners and researchers.

Keywords: Supply chain resilience analysis; Multi-modal transportation; Service network; Robust optimization; Budget-of-Uncertainty; Time uncertainty; Logistics network structure.

1. INTRODUCTION

The significance of supply chain resilience has been unprecedentedly spotlighted due to its increasing and critical importance in mitigating the uncertainties inherent in today's supply chain and logistics services. For example, during the COVID-19 pandemic, shipment delays from China to the U.S. spiked by 33 days (Statista, 2021). Another recent example is that car maker Tesla had to shut down their factory near Berlin for 2 weeks due to the delays in the supply chain following the Red Sea attack in 2024 (The Guardian, 2024). The unreliability of logistics services makes supply chains suffer from violent increases in costs, shipping delays, notable product shortages, and consequently surging product prices.

Supply chain resilience refers to an organization's capability to endure, adapt to, and recover from disruptions, to fulfill customer demand, maintain target performance levels, and sustain operations in vulnerable environments (Hosseini et al., 2019). Resilience analysis is a key step in the framework, where organizations can measure the supply chain reliability and identify the critical components and vulnerabilities within the supply chains, so that corresponding strategies to enhance the system performance can be designed. Contingent upon the progression of disruption events, resilience analysis can be divided into two phases: disruption phase (robustness and redundancy), and recovery phase (resourcefulness and rapidity) (Bruneau et al., 2003; Zhou et al., 2019). The focus of this work lies within enhancing comprehension of system performance and resilience during the disruption phase.

Given the significant impact of shipment delay on supply chain performance, we focus on the research problem of global logistics service network under travel time uncertainty for the distribution of perishable products. More precisely, it refers to the well-known transportation service network design problem, which concerns strategic, tactical or operational planning of services and operations to effectively meet demand while ensuring the profitability of the firm (Crainic, 2000). We study multimodal logistics service networks which integrate several transportation modes, i.e., airway, maritime, road, and railway. Furthermore, this work specifically addresses the products of degradation properties, where the value or quality diminishes with time. This study aims to explore the resilience of logistics service networks in the face of travel time uncertainty resulting from disruptions across various scenarios. It also examines the interactive effects of disruption scale, disruption degree, and network size on network resilience. The insights derived from this investigation are intended to inform future research and practical applications in resilience analysis.

This work aims to make the following contributions to related literature. Firstly, we employ robust optimization with budget-of-uncertainty as a tool to analyze the resilience of multi-modal logistics service networks under time uncertainty. The literature shows that robust optimization is commonly used in the problem of robust planning under uncertainties without specific probability distributions, to find the optimal solutions even for the worst-case scenarios, and with possible consideration of budget of uncertainty (Bertsimas and Sim, 2003). However, it has been rarely employed in supply chain resilience analysis. The application here is motivated by two reasons. First, during the unforeseen disruption phase, the impact of the event continues to evolve. It is difficult to gather sufficient historical data to establish the probability distribution of parameters, particularly for travel time, to which perishable products are extremely sensitive. Robust optimization will be more appropriate to this case. Second, we suggest applying the budget of uncertainly to initiate a new approach and perspective to take account of the decision-makers' willingness to accept the risk and the trade-offs between robustness and costs through the budget. The approach can also help identify the most critical and vulnerable components of the networks, which is particularly important for multi-modal services.

Secondly, we build a Mixed Integer Linear Programming (MILP) model to formulate the problem and minimize the total distribution costs in the worst-case scenarios. Numerical experiments using CPLEX solver are conducted to investigate the impacts of physical network structures and disruption scenarios. Moreover, sensitivity studies have been conducted to examine the three critical factors on resilience performance: network size, disruption scale, and disruption degree.

Section 2 provides a brief review of the related literature. Section 3 elaborates on the problem and introduces a robust MILP model. Section 4 describes the results and discusses on the findings from computational experiments. Finally, Section 5 provides a summary of this study.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Numerous modeling approaches have been developed to evaluate the performance of supply chain and logistics systems in the face of disruptions. Some reviews proposed to classify the relevant modeling approaches into different categories like mathematical or optimization modeling, topological modeling, simulation modeling, probability theory modeling (e.g. Bayesian network), fuzzy logic modeling, and data-driven modeling (Zhou et al., 2019). We refer readers to relevant literature reviews on quantitative analysis of supply chain and logistics system resilience: Hosseini et al. (2019), and Zhou et al. (2019).

The literature most relevant to our work can be discussed under the categorization. Khalili et al. (2017) applied stochastic programming to an integrated productiondistribution planning problem with uncertain production capacity, in order to find an optimal solution on the structure of the chain, risk mitigation, and recovery plan. In the second stage of the model, the worst-case scenario is considered to enhance the robustness of the solution. Dui et al. (2021) proposed a deterministic mathematical programming model to decide the recovery sequence of the nodes and edges when several or all nodes/edges fail. Yin et al. (2023) evaluated the functional and topological resilience of urban transportation network when exposed to different disruptions through traffic flow simulation model. Wu and Chen (2023) designed a new resilience indicator for transportation network particularly considering disruption of earthquakes and used Monte Carlo simulation to assess the system performance and investigate the feasibility of a proactive mitigation strategy. Bai et al. (2023) identified key nodes using simulation method and studied the impacts of traffic flow on the resilience of global liner shipping

network through a disintegration model. Furthermore, the authors proposed an innovative simulation model with tailored rules to evaluate the dynamic resilience of the system.

Robust optimization holds significant promise as a tool for studying supply chain and logistics resilience due to its computational tractability and non-reliance on probability distribution. This is particularly advantageous in scenarios involving unprecedented disruptions, where obtaining probability distributions is challenging due to the lack of historical data and the evolving of the disruption event. However, as noted by Hosseini et al. (2019), its potential remains underexplored. In the literature, robust optimization has been mostly applied in robust planning at the operational level, such as freight transportation planning. New techniques have been developed to overcome over-conservatism. For example, Zhang and Ding (2023) utilized min-max regret robust optimization to devise defensive strategies for an integrated electricitygas-transportation system during the pre-disaster phase, highlighting its capacity to mitigate decision-maker conservativeness. Pang et al. (2023) developed a robust optimization model with heuristic algorithm to address logistics service selection problems under time uncertainty. The authors applied budget of robustness proposed by Bertsimas and Sim (2003) to control the conservativeness of the solution. Distinguished from previous research, this paper focuses on network resilience analysis rather than operational planning, which is rarely investigated from the perspective of robust optimization. To bridge this gap, we aim to explore the potential of robust optimization with budget-of-uncertainty to assess network resilience, and investigate the resilience performance with various network structures and disruption profiles.

3. PROBLEM DESCRIPTION AND FORMULATION

3.1 Problem description

We consider a multi-modal logistics service network with different transport modes, i.e., railway, waterway, and airway modes in this paper. Each service $s \in \mathscr{S}$ corresponds to a type of transport mode, a designated route consisting of a sequential of city nodes, transportation costs, and average travel time, which includes average waiting time on each arc where it runs. Notice that, instead of considering the network as: $\mathscr{G} = \{\mathscr{N}, \mathscr{A}\}$ like in most previous studies, we apply a multi-modal service network $\mathscr{G} = \{\mathscr{N}, \mathscr{A}, \mathscr{V}\}$ to capture the service features in this problem. Set ${\mathscr N}$ is the set of all city nodes $i \in \mathcal{N}$ in the network, while \mathscr{A} is the set of all arcs $(i, j) \in \mathscr{A}$ which link two nodes by at least one service. Especially, we introduce the notation of service-arc v here as an arc corresponding to a specific service with a form of (s, i, j). The set of all service-arcs is indicated by \mathscr{V} .

To simplify, this work considers only one type of perishable product from one shipper. In order to analyze the design of the network, we consider each client is associated with only one order and one destination address. The demand quantity of each order for the product is the average demand of the corresponding client. All the products are released and prepared at the beginning of the scheduling. Prepared orders can either wait in the departure point (warehouse or factory) for transferring or start to transfer immediately depending on the schedule. Outbound date of each order is the first decision to make. Another decision is to find the optimal transport service selection (and combination) to ship each order from the departure point to its corresponding destination before the shelf-life of the product. The orders can be transshipped at any node in the network from any service entering this node to any service departing from this node. Without loss of generality, we make the following basic assumptions:

- Degradation rate is constant for the product and the quality or value degrades with time linearly. Besides, we only consider quality loss but not quantity loss.
- The order of each client is not allowed to be split during the whole transportation course.
- All orders must be delivered to their respective clients before the specified shelf-life; otherwise, the delivery is deemed a failure.
- Due date of delivery is set for each order. No on-time delivery will generate penalty cost, with higher rate for late arrival than early arrival.

Travel time along each service-arc is an uncertain parameter due to disruptions. We assume that the probability distribution of travel time is unknown, while the deviation range-the maximum and minimum travel time-is known in this study. We use robust optimization to find optimal solutions under even the worst-case scenario. The latter is defined by the latest arrival date of order (that could be after due date but must be prior to the shelf-life date). Robust optimization with budget-of-uncertainty is applied to mitigate the over-conservatism, where decision-makers can employ a budget to limit the number of service-arcs which will be delayed in the worst-case scenario. Overall, the goal of this problem is to schedule, over a given time horizon, the best outbound date (from departure point) and transport service selection for each order, to minimize total distribution costs, which include transportation cost by using the services, transshipment cost and degradation cost along the delivery, and penalty cost for early or late delivery to the destinations.

3.2 Mathematical formulation

Sets and indices

- \mathcal{N} : set of city nodes, $i \in \mathcal{N}$
- \mathscr{A} : set of arcs from node *i* to node *j*, $(i, j) \in \mathscr{A}$
- \mathscr{V} : set of service-arcs, $(s, i, j) \in \mathscr{V}$
- \mathscr{S} : set of transport services, $s \in \mathscr{S}$
- \mathscr{C} : set of clients, $c \in \mathscr{C}$
- o: node of departure point $o \in \mathcal{N}$
- d^c: destination of client c, d^c $\in \mathcal{N}$

Parameters and data

- q^c : demand quantity for the product of client c
- t^c_(s,i,j): uncertain parameter indicating the travel time (in day) of service-arc (s, i, j) for client c
- $\bar{t}_{(s,i,j)}$: nominal value of travel time (in day) on service-arc (s, i, j)
- $\hat{t}_{(s,i,j)}$: maximum deviation (delay) of travel time on service-arc (s, i, j)

- $f_{(s,i,j)}$: 1, if service s runs on arc (i, j); 0, otherwise
- *l*: shelf life of the product
- e^c : due date of client c
- $\varphi_{(s,i,j)}$: transportation cost of per unit product by service-arc (s, i, j)
- $\phi_{s_1,s_2}^{i_1,s_2}$: transshipment cost of per product from service s_1 to service s_2 at node i
- ψ : degradation cost of per product per day
- Γ: budget of travel time uncertainty

Decision variables

- w^c : continuous variable; the outbound time (in day) of the order by client c
- $\mathbf{x}_{(s,i,j)}^c$: binary variable; 1, if client *c* uses service-arc (s, i, j); 0, otherwise
- $u^c_{(s,i,j)}$: deviation degree of travel time on service-arc (s, i, j) in the worst case for client c
- $\mathbf{z}_{i}^{c,s_{1},s_{2}}$: binary variable; 1, if the order of client c is sorted for service transshipment at node i from service s_{1} to service s_{2} ; 0, otherwise
- k^c₋, k^c₊: intermediate variables; early and late delivery time of client c, respectively

The proposed MILP model is outlined as follows:

$$\min \Pi = \sum_{(s,i,j)\in\mathscr{A}} \sum_{c\in\mathcal{C}} \varphi_{(i,j)}^s * q^c * x_{(s,i,j)}^c + \sum_{i\in\mathscr{N}} \sum_{c\in\mathscr{C}} \sum_{s_1\in\mathscr{S}} \sum_{s_2\in\mathscr{S}} \phi_i^{s_1,s_2} * q^c * z_i^{c,s_1,s_2} + \psi * \sum_{c\in\mathscr{C}} q^c * (w^c + \max_{t\in T} \sum_{(s,i,j)\in\mathscr{V}} t_{(s,i,j)} * x_{(s,i,j)}^c) + \sum_{c\in\mathscr{C}} (\omega_e * q^c * k_c^- + \omega_a * q^c * k_c^+)$$
(1)

subject to:

$$\sum_{s \in \mathscr{S}} \sum_{i \in \mathscr{N}} x_{(s,i,j)}^c = \sum_{s \in \mathscr{S}} \sum_{i \in \mathscr{N}} x_{(s,j,i)}^c,$$
$$\forall c \in \mathscr{C}, j \in \mathscr{N} \setminus \{o, d^c\}$$
(2)

$$\sum_{s \in \mathscr{S}} \sum_{i \in \mathscr{N}} x_{(s,o,i)}^c = 1, \forall c \in \mathscr{C}$$
(3)

$$\sum_{s \in \mathscr{S}} \sum_{i \in \mathscr{N}} x_{(s,i,d_c)}^c = 1, \forall c \in \mathscr{C}$$

$$\tag{4}$$

$$x_{(s,i,j)}^c \le f_{(s,i,j)}, \forall c \in \mathscr{C}, (s,i,j) \in \mathscr{V}$$
(5)

$$z_{i}^{c,s_{1},s_{2}} \ge \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} x_{(s_{1},j,i)}^{c} + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} x_{(s_{2},i,j)}^{c} - 1,$$

$$\forall c \in \mathscr{C}, s_1 \in \mathscr{S}, s_2 \in \mathscr{S}, (s_1, j, i) \in \mathscr{V}, (s_2, i, j) \in \mathscr{V}$$
(6)

$$w^{c} + \max_{t \in \mathscr{T}} \sum_{(s,i,j) \in \mathscr{V}} t^{c}_{(s,i,j)} * x^{c}_{(s,i,j)} \le l, \forall c \in C$$

$$\tag{7}$$

$$w^{c} + \max_{t \in \mathscr{T}} \sum_{(s,i,j) \in \mathscr{V}} t^{c}_{(s,i,j)} * x^{c}_{(s,i,j)} - k^{c}_{+} \le e^{c}, \forall c \in C \quad (8)$$

$$w^{c} + \max_{t \in \mathscr{T}} \sum_{(s,i,j) \in \mathscr{V}} t^{c}_{(si,j)} * x^{c}_{(s,i,j)} + k^{c}_{-} \ge e^{c}, \forall c \in C \quad (9)$$

$$x_{(s,i,j)}^c, z_i^{c,s_1,s_2} \in \{0,1\},\$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\forall c \in \mathscr{C}, s_1 \in \mathscr{S}, s_2 \in \mathscr{S}, (s, i, j) \in \mathscr{V}, i \in \mathscr{N} \quad (10) \\ &w^c, u^c_{(s, i, j)}, k^c_-, k^c_+ \geq 0, \forall c \in \mathscr{C}, (s, i, j) \in \mathscr{V} \quad (11) \end{aligned}$$

Objective function (1) aims to minimize total distribution costs including the transportation cost, transshipment cost, cost of degraded product quality, and cost of early and late delivery. Constraints (2)-(4) denote the flow balance constraints. Constraint (5) ensures that the servicearc is selected from available service-arcs. Constraint (6) calculates the auxiliary variable related to transshipment. Constraint (7) guarantees the arrival time of the order for each client is before the shelf life of the product. Constraints (8) and (9) calculate the early and late span of delay respectively. Constraints (10) and (11) define the domain of the variables.

Given nominal value and deviation range of travel time on service-arcs, we formulate the time uncertainty set, which is used in the service time related constraints, i.e., constraints (1), and (7) - (9), as follows by applying robust optimization with budget-of-uncertainty (Bertsimas and Sim, 2003):

$$\mathcal{T} = \{ \boldsymbol{t} : t^c_{(s,i,j)} = t_{(s,i,j)} + u^c_{(s,i,j)} * t_{(s,i,j)},$$

$$\sum_{\substack{(s,i,j) \in \mathcal{V} \\ 0 \leq u^c_{(s,i,j)} \leq 1, \forall (s,i,j) \in \mathcal{V}, c \in \mathscr{C} \}}$$

$$(12)$$

The non-linear worst-case scenario part:

$$\max_{t \in \mathscr{T}} \sum_{(s,i,j) \in \mathscr{V}} t^c_{(s,i,j)} * x^c_{(s,i,j)}$$
(13)

in constraints (1), (7), and (8) can be linearized by the method in Bertsimas and Sim (2003) as formula (14) along with constraints (15) - (16).

$$\min \Gamma * \lambda^c + \sum_{(s,i,j)\in\mathscr{V}} (\bar{t}_{(s,i,j)} * x^c_{(s,i,j)} + \theta^c_{(s,i,j)})$$
(14)

$$\lambda^{c} + \theta^{c}_{(s,i,j)} \ge \hat{t}_{(s,i,j)} * x^{c}_{(s,i,j)}, \forall c \in \mathscr{C}, (s,i,j) \in \mathscr{V} \quad (15)$$

$$\lambda^{c}, \theta^{c}_{(s,i,j)} \ge 0, \forall c \in \mathscr{C}, (s,i,j) \in \mathscr{V}$$

$$(16)$$

Additionally, constraint (9) is linearized into constraints (17) - (21) by introducing auxiliary variables.

$$w^{c} + \sum_{(s,i,j)\in\mathscr{V}} (\bar{t}_{(s,i,j)} * x^{c}_{(s,i,j)} + \hat{t}_{(s,i,j)} * ux^{c}_{(s,i,j)}) + k^{c}_{-} \ge e^{c}, \forall c \in \mathscr{C}$$
(17)

$$ux_{(s,i,j)}^c \le x_{(s,i,j)}^c, \forall c \in \mathscr{C}, (s,i,j) \in \mathscr{V}$$

$$(18)$$

$$ux_{(s,i,j)}^{c} \le u_{(s,i,j)}^{c}, \forall c \in \mathscr{C}, (s,i,j) \in \mathscr{V}$$

$$\tag{19}$$

$$ux_{(s,i,j)}^{c} \ge u_{(s,i,j)}^{c} + x_{(s,i,j)}^{c} - 1, \forall c \in \mathscr{C}, (s,i,j) \in \mathscr{V}$$
(20)

$$ux_{(s,i,j)}^c \ge 0, \forall c \in \mathscr{C}, (s,i,j) \in \mathscr{V}$$

$$(21)$$

4. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS

4.1 Case setting

To investigate the impacts of size of the service network, i.e., the number of service-arcs $|\mathscr{V}|$ in the network, we designed three service networks, indicated as $\mathscr{G}_1, \mathscr{G}_2$, and \mathscr{G}_3 respectively, which utilize different transportation modes including railway, maritime way, and airway. We selected 27 and 48 arcs from the China-Europe transportation network to be the basic structure of the three networks. This is to say, $\mathscr{G}_1, \mathscr{G}_2$, and \mathscr{G}_3 share a common network basic, i.e., the same nodes set and arcs set. The services running on these arcs distinguish among these three service networks. \mathscr{G}_1 consists of 16 services and 50 service-arcs and most of the arcs are equipped with one service. Based on \mathscr{G}_1 , we added more services to each arc in \mathscr{G}_2 and \mathscr{G}_3 so that \mathscr{G}_2 has 25 services and 100 service-arcs while 38 services and 150 service-arcs for \mathscr{G}_3 .

Five clients are designed by randomly choosing cities from the network as destinations, with the demand quantity determined by a uniform distribution U[5, 10]. Experiments are implemented with 1, 3, and 5 clients respectively, selected sequentially from the designed clients set. The shelf life of the product is set as 30 days. The transportation cost and time associated with each service-arc are considered related to the service mode and distance of the arc. The distance (km) between each two nodes ranges between [300, 12500]. Given the distance, transportation time is calculated according to the speed of the service mode: 800-1000 km/h for airway, 50-70 km/h for railway, and 46.3-50.0 km/h for waterway, while transportation cost per km is 1-2 euros, 0.15-0.30, and 0.05-0.20, respectively. The transshipment cost at each node respects uniform distribution U[10, 15] if the two services are the same transport modes; U[15, 25] otherwise. Degradation cost of one unit of product per day is 10% of the product value, which is determined as 100 here. Early and late delivery cost per unit of product per client per day are 15% and 20% of the product value respectively.

4.2 Results with sensitivity analysis

We conducted computational experiments on both small and large-scale cases to validate the effectiveness of the MILP model proposed in this paper and investigate the resilience performance of the transportation networks. The model was programmed in MATLAB R2022a and executed by IBM ILOG CPLEX 12.10.0.0 on a DELL computer equipped with an Intel Core i7-10700 CPU processor (2.90 GHz) and 64.0 GB of RAM.

The experiment comprises 225 instances, varying in network size $(|\mathcal{V}|)$, the proportion of uncertain service-arcs (PUV) in the network, deviation rate, and client size. More precisely, $|\mathcal{V}| \in \{50, 100, 150\}$, PUV and deviation rate take value from [0%, 25%, 50%, 75%, 100%]. To keep the neutral impact of the decision-maker's optimism, Γ is set as $50\% * |\mathscr{V}|$. For example, in Instance2 (50_25_25), the network comprises 50 service-arcs, where 25% of the network (PUV = 25%), i.e., 13 services-arcs, have travel time uncertainty, and the deviation rate is 25% which means the maximum delay \hat{t} of each uncertain service-arc is $25\% * \bar{t}$. All the instances can be solved to optimal in 5 hours. The sensitivity experiments on 1-client, 3-clients, and 5-clients cases are shown in Table 1, Table 2, and Table 3 respectively. Column In indicates the instance number, while columns 2 and 3 present the value of $|\mathcal{V}|$ and PUV respectively. The optimal objective function value found for each instance with a particular deviation rate is shown in columns 4-7. The last column indicates the average solving time for the instances with different deviation rates. Note that for the instances with PUV = 0%, such as In. 1, 6, 11, etc., the deviation rate has no effect on the optimal results (with no disruption occurred).



Fig. 1. Sensitivity analysis results on network size (50, 100, 150), deviation rate, and proportion of uncertain service-arc

Figure 1 illustrates the overall results of Tables 1-3. The first three groups are the results obtained on the instances with only one client, while the three groups in the middle are for 3-clients instances and the last three for 5-clients instances. The resilience performance is evaluated by the total costs change across different instances. Common trends in the change of total costs are explored and analyzed as follows:

Table 1. Results of 1-client experiments

In.	$ \mathscr{V} $	PUV		time			
			25%	50%	75%	100%	100s
1	50	0%	12246	12246	12246	12246	0.5
2		25%	12853	13461	24615	25155	2
3		50%	12853	13461	25056	25866	2
4		75%	13191	24426	25056	25866	2
5		100%	14025	24786	25866	153613	2
6	100	0%	19506	19506	19506	19506	1
7		25%	19506	19506	19506	19506	5
8		50%	19678	20555	21433	26453	5
9		75%	19880	20960	26392	26662	5
10		100%	20150	21500	28588	35216	5
11	150	0%	14847	14847	14847	14847	3
12		25%	14847	14847	14847	14847	8
13		50%	15426	15597	15597	15597	9
14		75%	15619	16362	17239	22443	8
15		100%	15889	17172	22376	25633	12

Table 2. Results of 3-clients experiments

In.	$ \mathscr{V} $	PUV		time			
			25%	50%	75%	100%	100s
16	50	0%	27765	27765	27765	27765	2
17		25%	28373	28980	40135	40675	12
18		50%	28373	28980	40576	41386	12
19		75%	28710	39946	40856	42086	12
20		100%	29598	41321	155852	283599	49
21	100	0%	44299	44299	44299	44299	6
22		25%	44299	44299	44299	44375	25
23		50%	44470	45347	46371	52021	26
24		75%	44672	45752	51803	52777	25
25		100%	44942	46567	54552	62192	30
26	150	0%	31633	31633	31633	31633	19
27		25%	31633	31633	31633	31633	62
28		50%	32343	32993	33126	33126	65
29		75%	32871	34561	36461	43524	64
30		100%	33952	37811	45232	50354	70

- (1) Upon examining the results on the instance with a certain client size, it becomes evident that the change of total costs within network \mathscr{G}_1 are significantly higher compared to network \mathscr{G}_2 and \mathscr{G}_3 generally. The reason is \mathscr{G}_1 has only 50 services-arcs, where the most cases are only one service is available on each arc. This is to say, when disruptions happen and the current solution is not the best any more, the shipper has to choose another substitute arc instead of just changing the service, which might cause higher costs change. \mathscr{G}_2 and \mathscr{G}_3 outperform since bigger network size guarantees more alternative service-arc options. Especially, under the disruption profile of 100% PUV and 100%deviation rate, the costs by \mathscr{G}_1 are super high, where the fastest and extremely expensive airway mode has to be used to meet the requests. This further proves the vulnerability of small networks and necessity of improving the network size to an appropriate setting.
- (2) Within any network among \mathscr{G}_1 , \mathscr{G}_2 and \mathscr{G}_3 , the total costs exhibit a non-linear growth with an increase on the *PUV* at a specific deviation rate. The variation of total costs on each interval of *PUV* is heavily dependant on the service-arcs newly introduced to the uncertainty pool. For example, the instance of 5 clients, within \mathscr{G}_2 under deviation rate of 100%, the change of total costs on the *PUV* interval

Table 3. Results of 5-client experiments

In.	$ \mathscr{V} $	PUV		time			
			25%	50%	75%	100%	100s
31	50	0%	47233	47233	47233	47233	6
32		25%	47953	48897	65484	67022	25
33		50%	52996	53654	65924	70281	25
34		75%	53334	65373	67482	90053	26
35		100%	54716	79262	194293	397358	29
36	100	0%	74146	74146	74146	74146	15
37		25%	74146	74146	74146	74146	60
38		50%	74317	75195	76848	94563	61
39		75%	74520	75825	82852	95319	62
40		100%	74790	77305	98893	107272	71
41	150	0%	63247	63247	63247	63247	62
42		25%	64724	65581	66084	66766	146
43		50%	65011	65962	66980	69760	150
44		75%	65453	67342	70084	71951	146
45		100%	66045	75089	79768	97523	150

[25%, 50%] is much higher than on the PUV interval [50%, 75%]. This phenomenon arises because the service-arcs added to uncertainty set of 50% PUV hold greater significance for the shipper and clients compared to those introduced to the uncertainty set of 75% PUV. This underscores the importance of identifying critical components, i.e., service-arc in this work, in transportation networks. Additionally, this observation can facilitate the identification of critical service-arcs in \mathscr{G}_2 based on the service-arcs newly introduced to the set of 50% PUV.

(3) Within network \mathscr{G}_1 with one client, the total costs remain manageable under disruption profile of 100% PUV and 75% deviation rate, but increase dramatically when deviation rate rises from 75% to 100%. This means the robustness degree of network \mathscr{G}_1 against disruption is 75%. However, for both 3-clients and 5-clients instances with 100% PUV, the heavy change in total costs occurs when the deviation rate increases from 50% to 75%. This indicates the clients set in the 3-clients and 5-clients instances, especially 3-clients, are more sensitive to disruptions. Similarly, given 100% deviation rate within \mathscr{G}_1 , the costs change of 5-clients instances increases much more when PUVvaries from 50% to 75% than the ones of 3-clients and 1-client instances. This implies that the 2 clients in the 5-client set are more sensitive to the disruption on the service-arcs introduced to the uncertainty set of 75% PUV within \mathscr{G}_1 . These findings furthermore confirm the criticality of considering demand distribution in transportation network resilience.

5. CONCLUSION

In this work, we explore the potential of robust optimization on resilience analysis and propose a robust optimization model with budget-of-uncertainty for the multimodal freight logistics service network with travel time uncertainty. Shippers can leverage the proposed model for multiple purposes: first to measure the reliability and resilience of their logistics service network, then to select and plan robust services. This can be achieved by utilizing existing knowledge of the service network structure, service quality information (service time, cost), product information (deteriorating rate, expiration date, if applicable), and the decision-maker's evaluation of the impacts of disruptions. Computational experiments are implemented to investigate the impacts of network structure, disruption scale, and disruption degree on the performance of the service networks. Sensitivity analysis on three critical factors indicates that the network size and demand distribution significantly affect service network resilience. Enhancing resilience by augmenting network size through the identification of critical service-arcs can be highly effective. Moreover, incorporating demand distribution into the analysis can provide more accurate assessment of resilience and identification of critical service-arcs. Nevertheless, further improvements are expected in numerical experiments and sensitivity analysis on the effectiveness of budget, particularly through the integration of real-life cases. Additionally, future research could focus on designing and evaluating various strategies to enhance resilience using the proposed robust optimization methods. Lastly, the

proposed model can be compared with stochastic models to further obtain academic insights.

REFERENCES

- Bai, X., Ma, Z., and Zhou, Y. (2023). Data-driven static and dynamic resilience assessment of the global liner shipping network. *Transportation Research Part E: Logistics and Transportation Review*, 170, 103016.
- Bertsimas, D. and Sim, M. (2003). Robust discrete optimization and network flows. *Mathematical program*ming, 98(1), 49–71.
- Bruneau, M., Chang, S.E., Eguchi, R.T., Lee, G.C., O'Rourke, T.D., Reinhorn, A.M., Shinozuka, M., Tierney, K., Wallace, W.A., and Von Winterfeldt, D. (2003). A framework to quantitatively assess and enhance the seismic resilience of communities. *Earthquake spectra*, 19(4), 733–752.
- Crainic, T.G. (2000). Service network design in freight transportation. European journal of operational research, 122(2), 272–288.
- Dui, H., Zheng, X., and Wu, S. (2021). Resilience analysis of maritime transportation systems based on importance measures. *Reliability Engineering & System* Safety, 209, 107461.
- Hosseini, S., Ivanov, D., and Dolgui, A. (2019). Review of quantitative methods for supply chain resilience analysis. *Transportation research part E: logistics and transportation review*, 125, 285–307.
- Khalili, S.M., Jolai, F., and Torabi, S.A. (2017). Integrated production-distribution planning in two-echelon systems: a resilience view. *International Journal of Production Research*, 55(4), 1040–1064.
- Pang, Y., Pan, S., and Ballot, E. (2023). Robust optimization for perishable product distribution under uncertainty of multimodal transportation services. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 56(2), 7620–7625.
- Statista (2021). Lost in transit: Major delays plague china-u.s. shipping. https://www.statista.com/cha rt/26045/ocean-freight-transit-time-china-us/.
- The Guardian (2024). Tesla pauses german production after red sea shipping attacks. https://www.thegua rdian.com/technology/2024/jan/12/tesla-pause s-german-production-because-of-red-sea-shipp ing-attacks.
- Wu, Y. and Chen, S. (2023). Resilience modeling and prehazard mitigation planning of transportation network to support post-earthquake emergency medical response. *Reliability Engineering & System Safety*, 230, 108918.
- Yin, K., Wu, J., Wang, W., Lee, D.H., and Wei, Y. (2023). An integrated resilience assessment model of urban transportation network: A case study of 40 cities in china. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 173, 103687.
- Zhang, Y. and Ding, Z. (2023). Full-time scale resilience enhancement strategies for an integrated electricity-gastransportation coupled system. *Applied Mathematical Modelling*, 117, 63–86.
- Zhou, Y., Wang, J., and Yang, H. (2019). Resilience of transportation systems: concepts and comprehensive review. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation* Systems, 20(12), 4262–4276.