
ON THE COMPLETENESS OF SEVERAL FORTIFICATION-INTERDICTION GAMES IN THE POLYNOMIAL HIERARCHY

Alberto Boggio Tomasaz
Università degli Studi di Milano
Dipartimento di Informatica, Milano, Italy

Margarida Carvalho
CIRRELT and Département d'Informatique et de Recherche Opérationnelle
Université de Montréal, Montréal, QC, Canada

Roberto Cordone
Università degli Studi di Milano
Dipartimento di Informatica, Milano, Italy

Pierre Hosteins
Università degli Studi di Torino,
Dipartimento di Informatica, Torino, Italy
e-mail: hosteins@di.unito.it

ABSTRACT

Fortification-interdiction games are tri-level adversarial games where two opponents act in succession to protect, disrupt and simply use an infrastructure for a specific purpose. Many such games have been formulated and tackled in the literature through specific algorithmic methods, however very few investigations exist on the completeness of such fortification problems in order to locate them rigorously in the polynomial hierarchy. We clarify the completeness status of several well-known fortification problems, such as the Tri-level Interdiction Knapsack Problem with unit fortification and attack weights, the Max-flow Interdiction Problem and Shortest Path Interdiction Problem with Fortification, the Multi-level Critical Node Problem with unit weights, as well as a well-studied electric grid defence planning problem. For all of these problems, we prove their completeness either for the Σ_2^P or the Σ_3^P class of the polynomial hierarchy¹. We also prove that the Multi-level Fortification-Interdiction Knapsack Problem with an arbitrary number of protection and interdiction rounds and unit fortification and attack weights is complete for any level of the polynomial hierarchy, therefore providing a useful basis for further attempts at proving the completeness of protection-interdiction games at any level of said hierarchy.

Keywords: Protection-interdiction games, Computational complexity, Polynomial hierarchy, Tri-level problems, electric grid protection

1 Introduction

The field of interdiction games has known a substantial amount of research in the last two decades. Such problems, also called *Stackelberg games*, represent the sequential action of two opposite players who seek to optimise the same objective function but in opposite directions. By nature such problems are bi-level, with a *follower* agent reacting to the decision of a *leader* agent. In their basic version, the follower, also named *defender*, tries to perform a certain action in the best possible way after the leader, or *attacker*, has invested a limited amount of resources to disable or disrupt some element of the problem. For example, the defender aims to maximise a flow, find a shortest path between an origin and a destination node, select a set of items given some capacity constraint, etc... whereas the attacker disables items to pack, edges or nodes of a network, etc... Such problems have become very popular, as they allow us to understand the weak points of, e.g., critical infrastructures and to assess the robustness of such infrastructures to worst-case failures or malevolent attacks. They have a wide range of possible applications, from the analysis of

¹The demonstration of the Σ_2^P -completeness of the Bi-level Interdiction Knapsack Problem provided in Section 2.1 has also been accepted for publication in the proceedings of the *International Conference on Optimization and Decision Science ODS2024*.

electric power grids [31] or water distribution networks [39] to telecommunications [2], nuclear smuggling [34], drug network dismantling [27], public healthcare [3], and so on.

The most classical interdiction problems are based on the attack of network elements to disrupt classic graph problems, such as maximising a quantity of flow (Maximum Flow Interdiction Problem or MFIP [36]) or minimising the length of the shortest path between an origin and a destination node (Shortest Path Interdiction Problem or SPIP [20]). While these problems usually consider attacks on network arcs, other interdiction problems focus more on identifying the most vital nodes whose removal has the largest impact on network connectivity, such as the Critical Node Problem (CNP), see [23] for a survey of the literature on the CNP. Even though those problems are bi-level in nature, they are based on a lower level problem which is polynomially solvable. Hence, these problems belong to the class NP and are usually NP-complete in the general case [1, 20, 36]. More recently, harder interdiction problems have been considered, where the lower level is NP-hard and which are therefore not necessarily located in NP. This is the case of an interdiction version of the Knapsack Problem (KP), called Bi-level Interdiction Knapsack Problem (BIKP), where a leader, subject to an attack budget, can interdict a subset of items which cannot be packed by the follower when maximising the profit of the basic KP [7, 13, 14, 35]. A version of this problem where the lower level KP weights are equal to the item profits is proved to be Σ_2^P -complete, along with other bi-level KPs, in [8]. Other interdiction problems with an NP-hard lower level have been shown to be Σ_2^P -complete, such as the Maximum Clique Interdiction Problem [18] and the Facility Location Interdiction Problem [17].

Since the interdiction games often have the aim of identifying the most vital elements of the problem at hand, a natural extension of such problems is to add another layer of decision in order to protect some of the problem elements against a possible attack. For example, an extension of the CNP (which aims at fragmenting a graph into separate maximally connected components) is proposed in [5] to add a certain number of edges in the graph prior to the nodes attack, in order to increase the robustness of the graph. The most common intervention studied to protect against interdiction is called *fortification*, i.e., rendering a subset of elements *immune* to any attack. The resulting problems have been labelled as Defender-Attacker-Defender (DAD) problems [6]. Virtually any existing interdiction problem can be extended to a fortification version of the same problem. Examples of such fortification problems, numerically tackled in the literature with several algorithmic approaches, are the Shortest Path Interdiction Problem with Fortification (SPIPF) [26, 24], the Tri-level Interdiction Knapsack Problem (TIKP) [24], the Capacitated Lot Sizing Interdiction Problem with Fortification (CLSIPF) [26] or the Travelling Salesman Problem with Interdiction and Fortification (TSPIF) [25]. Focusing more on the application side, some specific fortification problems have been investigated, such as the fortification version of an electric power grid interdiction problem, which we will call Tri-level Electric Power Grid Fortification Problem (TEPGFP) [9, 16, 38], the fortification of water distribution networks [39] or the defence of critical infrastructures in homeland security [6]. A variant of the CNP with fortification has also been considered, where the attacker can infect a subset of the graph nodes with a virus which will automatically spread through the graph edges, while a defender first vaccinates a subset of nodes against the virus and later protects a subset of nodes through quarantine after the attacker has acted. This problem is called Multi-level Critical Node Problem (MCNP) and has been introduced in [4].

Even though many works have tackled tri-level problems with fortification, surprisingly few of them address the computational complexity of such problems. Given that tri-level linear programming is in general Σ_3^P -complete [21], tri-level fortification problems will in general not be in class NP, which implies that they will require advanced, sophisticated decomposition methods in order to be solved [4, 38]. In particular, no compact single level reformulation exists for such problems. Known complexity results include the Σ_3^P -completeness of the TIKP with equal weights and profits for the lower level KP and the Σ_3^P -completeness of the MCNP with arbitrary weights (vaccination, infection and protection weights as well as profits following the terminology introduced in the previous paragraph) over trees [28]. A few results also exist for related problems in robust programming, such as the Σ_3^P -completeness of several two-stage adjustable and robust recoverable optimisation problems with *discrete* budgeted uncertainty [19]. We observe that, in general, fortification problems are tackled with unitary fortification and attack costs, meaning that the fortification and interdiction budget constraints are actually cardinality constraints on the subsets of fortified and interdicted objects, probably for reasons of simplicity in designing the problem instances to tackle numerically. Hence, complexity results for such “unitary” versions are desirable.

Paper contributions: We clarify the computational complexity of several fortification problems, either directly tackled in the literature or serving as a basis for proving the completeness of other fortification problems in the future. More specifically, we prove:

- The completeness for any level of the polynomial hierarchy of the Multi-level Interdiction Knapsack Problem with an arbitrary number of fortification and interdiction rounds, with unit fortification and attack costs (therefore refining the results of [8, 28]).

- The Σ_2^P -completeness of the SPIPF and TEPGFP with unit fortification costs, and of the MFIP with Fortification (MFIPF) with unit costs for both fortification and attack.
- The Σ_3^P -completeness of the MCNP with unit weights (at any level) and profits, refining the result of [28].

Paper Organisation In Section 2, we will tackle the interdiction version of the KP and show that the bi-level and tri-level versions are, respectively, Σ_2^P and Σ_3^P -complete with unit attack and fortification costs, closing the section with a generalisation of our proof to any level of the polynomial hierarchy. In Section 3, we move to the fortification version of the MFIP and prove that it is Σ_2^P -complete, still with unit attack and fortification costs. In Section 4 we prove the Σ_2^P -completeness of the fortification version of the SPIP with unit fortification costs. Moving to an interdiction-fortification problem in which the attacker deletes nodes, we will demonstrate the Σ_3^P -completeness of the MCNP with only unit weights and profits in Section 5, therefore demonstrating completeness on a more general set of instances w.r.t. to the work of [28]. Finally, we will clarify the status of the TEPGFP in Appendix B by establishing its Σ_2^P -complete nature and provide our conclusions.

Given the wide variety of problems tackled, where possible we keep the notation consistent with the one used in the original papers. However, we will also try and make it more uniform when necessary to avoid confusion, in particular when dealing with multi-level versions of the same problem.

2 The Multi-level Interdiction Knapsack Problem

In this section we will tackle the interdiction version of the Knapsack Problem, as presented in Section 1. As already stated earlier, the computational complexity of the bi-level and tri-level versions of this problem have been investigated in the literature, for specific versions where each item has an arbitrary fortification and attack cost, plus a packing weight for the lower level (classic KP) which is equal to the item profit [8, 28]. We will consider the slightly more general version where the lower level packing weights are not equal to the profits. However, we will concentrate on versions where the fortification and attack costs are unitary. This could be useful in future endeavours on other fortification problems where such costs are also unitary, as it will allow to reduce the interdiction knapsack problems to them. Unfortunately, the reductions proposed in the previous works of [8, 28] are highly dependent on the presence of attack and fortification costs, which are used to differentiate between the knapsack items that are mapped to the different levels of the problems used for the reduction. It is therefore impossible to use those reductions as proposed in those works when the attack and fortification costs are unitary. We stress that our results are also interesting from a purely theoretical perspective, since in the single level KP, computational complexity tends to be strongly affected when a set of weights/profits becomes unitary (as the problem goes from being weakly NP-hard to polynomial). It is therefore a legitimate concern to establish the consequences of adopting unit costs for the higher decision levels in interdiction versions of the KP. In this section, we will establish that even with unitary fortification and attack costs, the BIKP and TIKP are respectively complete for the second and third level of the polynomial hierarchy. We will close this section by sketching how to extend the proof of completeness for any number of fortification and interdiction rounds, showing that the problem is complete for any level of the polynomial hierarchy.

2.1 The Bi-level Interdiction Knapsack Problem with unit attack costs

Our definition of the decision version of the Bi-level Interdiction Knapsack Problem with unit attack costs is the following. The indices used for sets and parameters refer to the decision level (1 for the defender, 2 for the attacker), for consistency with the multi-level generalisation in Section 2.3. We also adopt the convention that, when dealing with the decision version of the optimisation problems considered in this work, we drop the word *Problem* at the end of their name, or the *P* at the end of their acronym.

UNITARY BILEVEL INTERDICTION KNAPSACK (UBIK):

INSTANCE: A finite set of items I such that each $i \in I$ has a positive integer weight w_i and a positive integer profit p_i , a positive integer capacity W and a positive integer profit goal \bar{K} for the follower, a positive integer budget B_2 for the leader.

QUESTION: Is there a subset $I_2 \subseteq I$ of items for the attacker to forbid, with cardinality $|I_2| \leq B_2$, such that every subset $I_1 \subseteq I \setminus I_2$ with $\sum_{i \in I_1} w_i \leq W$ that the defender can select has a total profit $\sum_{i \in I_1} p_i < \bar{K}$?

In order to prove that the above problem is complete for the second level of the polynomial hierarchy, we will use the following problem, known to be Σ_2^P -complete [37]:

2-ALTERNATING QUANTIFIED SATISFIABILITY ($\mathcal{B}_2 \cap \overline{3CNF}$):

INSTANCE: Disjoint non-empty sets of Boolean variables X and Y , and a Boolean expression E over $U = X \cup Y$ in conjunctive normal form with at most 3 literals in each clause $c \in C$.

QUESTION: Is there a truth assignment for X such that for all truth assignments of Y , E is never satisfied?

We will then introduce a reduction from $\mathcal{B}_2 \cap \overline{3CNF}$ to UBIK which draws inspiration from the reduction from 3-SAT to Subset Sum presented in [10, Theorem 34.15]. The basic idea of this reduction is to build weights, profits, capacity and profit goal of UBIK encoded in base 10, with digits associated with variables and clauses of $\mathcal{B}_2 \cap \overline{3CNF}$, in such a way that any comparison between a sum of integer values (weights or profits) and a reference integer value (capacity or profit goal) can be performed digit by digit, without carries from lower digits to higher ones.

- For each variable $u \in U$, we create two items i_u and $i_{\bar{u}}$, one for each possible truth assignment of u . We define $I_X = \{i_x, i_{\bar{x}} : x \in X\}$ and $I_Y = \{i_y, i_{\bar{y}} : y \in Y\}$. For variables $x \in X$, we introduce a third item j_x , which will serve to force the leader to choose one and only one item between i_x and $i_{\bar{x}}$. In order to ensure a sensible mapping of the variable assignment between Y and I_Y , we also introduce a fourth item j'_x for $x \in X$ to help saturate the budget of the follower for X -related digits (leaving therefore only the Y -related digits of the budget W available for selecting items from I_Y in I_1).
- For each clause $c \in C$, we create two items i_c^1, i_c^2 . We designate by I_C the set of items associated with C .
- We now introduce weights and profits for all the created items through a set of digits, each multiplied by a different power of 10, as previously discussed. This is exemplified in Table 1 where these digits are displayed in the different columns of the table and form a (large) number when put right next to each other. The least significant $|C|$ digits are labelled by the clauses, the next $|Y|$ digits by the variables Y , the next $2|X|$ digits by the variables X , two for each variable $x \in X$. Finally, the most significant positions form a set starting at position $M = |C| + |Y| + 2|X| + 1$. For the sake of simplicity, with a slight abuse of notation, we will sometimes refer to the integer value encoded in these positions as a “digit”.

- For each $y \in Y$, the two corresponding items i_y and $i_{\bar{y}}$ have weights and profits ($w_{i_y}, p_{i_y}, w_{i_{\bar{y}}}$ and $p_{i_{\bar{y}}}$) with digit 1 in the position labelled by the variable y and 0 in the positions labelled by other variables.

If literal y appears in clause $c \in C$, then p_{i_y} and w_{i_y} have digit 1 in the position labelled as c , and 0 otherwise. Similarly, if literal $\neg y$ appears in clause $c \in C$, $p_{i_{\bar{y}}}$ and $w_{i_{\bar{y}}}$ have digit 1 in the position labelled by c , and 0 otherwise.

In the small example detailed in Table 1, for example, variable c is the first of the two variables in Y and appears in the third (and last) clause, therefore we have $w_{i_c} = p_{i_c} = 10,001$.

- For each $x \in X$, the two corresponding items i_x and $i_{\bar{x}}$ have weights w_{i_x} and $w_{i_{\bar{x}}}$ and profits p_{i_x} and $p_{i_{\bar{x}}}$ with digit 1 in the higher of the two positions labelled by variable x and 0 in the lower one and in the positions labelled by other variables.

If literal x appears in clause $c \in C$, then p_{i_x} and w_{i_x} have digit 1 in the position labelled as c , and 0 otherwise. Similarly, if literal $\neg x$ appears in clause $c \in C$, $p_{i_{\bar{x}}}$ and $w_{i_{\bar{x}}}$ have digit 1 in the position labelled by c , and 0 otherwise. The weights and profits have digit 0 in all remaining positions. As the first variable in X , present in the 1st and 3rd clause, variable a from the example of Table 1 provides the weight $w_{i_a} = 100,000,101$ and profit $p_{i_a} = 1,100,000,101$ which differ by the leftmost digit.

The item j_x corresponding to x has weight and profit with digit 2 in the higher position labelled as x (and 0 elsewhere).

The item j'_x corresponding to x has weight $w_{j'_x}$ with digit 1 in the higher position labelled as x and profit p_{j_x} with digit 1 in the lower one (and 0 elsewhere).

Using again the example of Table 1 with variable a , we have for item j_a that $w_{j_a} = p_{j_a} = 200,000,000$ with a digit only in the left column associated to a and for item j'_a we have $w_{j'_a} = 100,000,000$ and $p_{j'_a} = 10,000,000$ where the profit has a digit only in the right column associated to a .

- For each $c \in C$, the first item has weight and profit with digit 1 in the position labelled as c and 0 elsewhere, and the second item has weight and profit with digit 2 in the position labelled as c and 0 elsewhere. For the first clause out of three in Table 1, we have that $w_{i_{c_1}^1} = p_{i_{c_1}^1} = 100$ while $w_{i_{c_2}^1} = p_{i_{c_2}^1} = 200$.

I		M	X				Y		C		
			a	b	c	d			c_1	c_2	c_3
i_a	w_{i_a}	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
	p_{i_a}	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
$i_{\bar{a}}$	$w_{i_{\bar{a}}}$	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
	$p_{i_{\bar{a}}}$	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
j_a	w_{j_a}	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	p_{j_a}	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
j'_a	$w_{j'_a}$	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	$p_{j'_a}$	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
i_b	w_{i_b}	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1
	p_{i_b}	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1
$i_{\bar{b}}$	$w_{i_{\bar{b}}}$	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
	$p_{i_{\bar{b}}}$	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
j_b	w_{j_b}	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
	p_{j_b}	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
j'_b	$w_{j'_b}$	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
	$p_{j'_b}$	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
i_c	w_{i_c}	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
	p_{i_c}	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
$i_{\bar{c}}$	$w_{i_{\bar{c}}}$	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
	$p_{i_{\bar{c}}}$	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
i_d	w_{i_d}	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
	p_{i_d}	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
$i_{\bar{d}}$	$w_{i_{\bar{d}}}$	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
	$p_{i_{\bar{d}}}$	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
$i_{c_1}^1$	$w_{i_{c_1}^1}$	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
	$p_{i_{c_1}^1}$	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
$i_{c_1}^2$	$w_{i_{c_1}^2}$	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
	$p_{i_{c_1}^2}$	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
$i_{c_2}^1$	$w_{i_{c_2}^1}$	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
	$p_{i_{c_2}^1}$	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
$i_{c_2}^2$	$w_{i_{c_2}^2}$	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
	$p_{i_{c_2}^2}$	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
$i_{c_3}^1$	$w_{i_{c_3}^1}$	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	$p_{i_{c_3}^1}$	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
$i_{c_3}^2$	$w_{i_{c_3}^2}$	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	$p_{i_{c_3}^2}$	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
W		0	2	0	2	0	1	1	4	4	4
\bar{K}		2	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	4	4

Figure 1: Example of construction of UBIK from an instance $\mathcal{B}_2 \cap \overline{3CNF}$ with $E = (a \vee b \vee \neg c) \wedge (\neg a \vee \neg b \vee d) \wedge (a \vee b \vee c)$, where $X = \{a, b\}$, $Y = \{c, d\}$ and the clauses are labelled from left to right. Given the digits provided in the different columns, we have, e.g., for item i_a : $w_{i_a} = 100,000,101$ and $p_{i_a} = 1,100,000,101$.

- The attack budget B_2 is equal to $|X|$.
- The capacity W has digit 1 in all positions labelled as variables in Y , 2 in all higher positions labelled as variables in X , 4 in all positions labelled as clauses in C , and digit 0 elsewhere. Hence, I_1 can contain any item from I_X (as long as not interdicted).
- The profit goal \bar{K} has digit 4 for all positions with labels in C and 1 for all positions with labels in U . The positions starting at M encode the integer value $|X|$.

See Figure 1 for an illustration of the proposed reduction. The reduction is polynomial because the profit goal has $|C| + |Y| + 2|X| + \lceil \log_{10}|X| \rceil$ decimal digits and the other numbers are smaller.

Analysing an instance from the above reduction, we can infer the following properties:

Property 2.1. *If the leader does not interdict either i_x or $i_{\bar{x}}$ for each $x \in X$, the follower can reach the profit goal \bar{K} .*

Proof. First of all, the attack budget forbids to interdict more than $|X|$ items. If the leader interdicts strictly less than $|X|$ items of I_X , the capacity of the follower allows to select all the uninterdicted items from I_X , reaching the profit goal \bar{K} . Hence, only those solutions where the leader interdicts exactly $|X|$ items from I_X (and no item j_x or j'_x for $x \in X$) will be of interest for the rest of the proof. For such solutions, the follower has enough capacity to select all uninterdicted items from I_X and must select them (any other possibility leading to a failure to reach the profit goal \bar{K}). Suppose that the two items i_x and $i_{\bar{x}}$ associated with the most significant digits whose label is $x \in X$ are taken simultaneously in I_2 . In this case, the follower can select item j_x , as well as all remaining uninterdicted items of I_X , achieving a profit of $|X|10^M + 2 \times 10^{|C|+|Y|+2|X|} > \bar{K}$. In the example of Table 1, consider, e.g., that the leader interdicts both i_a and $i_{\bar{a}}$: the follower has enough capacity to select i_b , $i_{\bar{b}}$ and also j_a , which provides a profit of 2,200,000,000 $> \bar{K}$. Suppose instead that the leader selects neither i_x nor $i_{\bar{x}}$: since, as already stated, the follower has enough budget to select all remaining I_X items, it is possible for I_1 to contain both i_x and $i_{\bar{x}}$ and the profit goal \bar{K} is automatically achieved, as the positions from M on have value $|X|$ and the highest digit associated with x is 2. The leader must therefore interdict one item between i_x and $i_{\bar{x}}$. Then, the follower can include item j'_x in I_1 in order to reach digit 1 in the lower position associated to x (while not enough residual capacity is available to select item j_x), and must do that in order to be able to reach profit \bar{K} . Consequently, the capacity associated to both digits associated to x is saturated.

This reasoning can then be recursively continued until we reach the lowest X -related position, ensuring the above property. \square

Property 2.2. *If the leader interdicts either i_x or $i_{\bar{x}}$ for each $x \in X$, in order to reach the profit goal \bar{K} the follower must necessarily select the remaining $|X|$ uninterdicted items of I_X , all j' items and either i_y or $i_{\bar{y}}$ for $y \in Y$.*

Proof. Suppose the leader does interdict exactly one item between i_x and $i_{\bar{x}}$ for each $x \in X$. The follower has enough capacity to select all remaining uninterdicted I_X items and must do so, otherwise it is impossible to reach value $|X|$ at position M . Following the reasoning in the proof of Property 2.1, the follower must also select all j'_x items, in order to reach digit 1 in all the lowest digits associated to each $x \in X$, therefore saturating the capacity associated to all X variables and forbidding to select any j item. In order to be able to reach the profit goal, the follower must also select a subset of items from I_Y :

- Consider the most significant digit whose label is in Y . Its two associated items cannot be taken simultaneously in I_1 as it would violate the weight capacity W . Taking none of them would forbid to achieve a profit of \bar{K} . Therefore, exactly one of these items must be taken, saturating the associated capacity.
- Consider the second most significant digit whose label is in Y . Its two associated items cannot be taken simultaneously, since that would result in a violation of the weight capacity W , and cannot be both neglected if the profit goal must be reached. Hence, as before, I_1 will include exactly one of the items associated with the second most significant digit in Y .
- The reasoning above propagates until the least significant digit labelled in Y .

We conclude that I_1 must include either i_y or $i_{\bar{y}}$ for all $y \in Y$. \square

Theorem 2.3. *UBIK is Σ_2^P -complete.*

Proof. The statement of UBIK is of the form $\exists I_2 \forall I_1 Q(I_2, I_1)$ where Q can be tested in polynomial time, directly implying that it is in Σ_2^P .

As mentioned above, we use a reduction from $\mathcal{B}_2 \cap \overline{3CNF}$ to prove the Σ_2^P -hardness of UBIK.

Let $\mathcal{B}_2 \cap \overline{3CNF}$ be a *Yes* instance. We form a solution to UBIK by packing in I_2 the items i_x such that $x \in X$ is 1 and the items $i_{\bar{x}}$, otherwise. Clearly, the cardinality of I_2 is equal to $|X|$. By Property 2.2, in order to try and reach the profit goal, the follower must include in I_1 all $|X|$ items associated with X not packed in I_2 , all j'_x items for $x \in X$ and exactly one of the items i_y or $i_{\bar{y}}$ for $y \in Y$. I_1 can be completed by items from I_C . However, since the $\mathcal{B}_2 \cap \overline{3CNF}$ instance is a *Yes* instance, there is at least a clause for which no item from I_X and I_Y with a non-zero value in the associated digit can be selected. For the digit corresponding to that clause, the prize of set I_1 cannot reach value 4 using only items of I_C and respecting the budget W . Therefore, UBIK is a *Yes* instance.

Next, suppose that UBIK is a *Yes* instance. According to Properties 2.1 and 2.2, I_2 must contain exactly one of the items i_x and $i_{\bar{x}}$ for $x \in X$ and I_1 will contain exactly one item between i_y and $i_{\bar{y}}$ for each $y \in Y$, otherwise the follower cannot achieve profit \bar{K} . However, since UBIK is a *Yes* instance, no choice of the follower allows to reach a value of 4 for all digits associated to C . This means that for at least one digit associated to C , none of the items of

X and Y with a digit 1 in said position can be selected. Assign value 1 to $x \in X$ such that $i_{\bar{x}} \in I_2$, and 0 otherwise. For any set I_1 of the follower, assign 1 to $y \in Y$ if $i_{\bar{y}} \in I_1$ and 0 if $i_y \in I_1$. Since, by hypothesis, UBIK is a *Yes* instance, there is no assignment of the Y variables such that E is satisfied in the corresponding SAT instance and the $\mathcal{B}_2 \cap \overline{3CNF}$ instance is a *Yes* instance. \square

Although the above proof follows a basis similar to the proof of Σ_3^P -completeness of the Tri-level Interdiction Knapsack Problem in [28], it required the introduction of new features in order to deal with the symmetry between the different items from the point of view of the attacker, given the equal value of all the interdiction costs. This is the meaning of the additional M column (to favour the choice of the I_X items by the attacker) and of the j_x and j'_x items (to force the attacker to interdict either i_x or $i_{\bar{x}}$).

2.2 The Tri-level Interdiction Knapsack Problem with unit attack and fortification costs

We now demonstrate the completeness of the TIKP with unit attack and fortification costs for the third level of the polynomial hierarchy. This version of the TIKP is defined as:

UNITARY TRILEVEL INTERDICTION KNAPSACK (UTIK):

INSTANCE: A set of items I such that each $i \in I$ has a positive integer weight w_i and a positive integer profit p_i , a positive integer capacity W and a positive integer profit goal \bar{K} , two positive integer budgets B_2 and B_3 for attack and fortification, respectively.
 QUESTION: Is there a subset $I_3 \subseteq I$ of items, with $|I_3| \leq B_3$, such that for every subset $I_2 \subseteq I \setminus I_3$, with $|I_2| \leq B_2$, there is a subset $I_1 \subseteq I \setminus I_2$, with $\sum_{i \in I_1} w_i \leq W$, such that $\sum_{i \in I_1} p_i \geq \bar{K}$ holds?

In order to prove the Σ_3^P -completeness of the above problem, we will use the following problem, known to be Σ_3^P -complete [32, 37]:

3-ALTERNATING QUANTIFIED SATISFIABILITY ($\mathcal{B}_3 \cap 3CNF$):

INSTANCE: Disjoint non-empty sets of variables X , Y and Z , and a Boolean expression E over $U = X \cup Y \cup Z$ in conjunctive normal form with at most 3 literals in each clause $c \in C$.
 QUESTION: Is there a 0-1 assignment for X such that for all 0-1 assignments of Y there is a 0-1 assignment of Z such that E is satisfied?

We will then use a reduction from $\mathcal{B}_3 \cap 3CNF$ similar to the one used to demonstrate the Σ_2^P -completeness of UBIK:

- For each variable $u \in U$, we create two items i_u and $i_{\bar{u}}$, one for each possible 0-1 assignment of u . We define $I_X = \{i_x, i_{\bar{x}} : x \in X\}$, $I_Y = \{i_y, i_{\bar{y}} : y \in Y\}$ and $I_Z = \{i_z, i_{\bar{z}} : z \in Z\}$. For variables of the intermediate decision level $y \in Y$, we introduce a third item j_y , which will serve to force the attacker to choose one and only one item between i_y and $i_{\bar{y}}$, as well as a fourth item j'_y which will serve to force the defender to choose one and only one item between i_z and $i_{\bar{z}}$ for each $z \in Z$.
- For each clause $c \in C$, we create two items i_c^1, i_c^2 . We designate by I_C the set of items associated with C .
- Weights, profits, maximum capacities, maximum profit and goal are positive integer numbers expressed in base 10. Each digit position is labelled by a variable or a clause, except the largest ones: the least significant $|C|$ positions are labelled by the clauses, the following $|Z|$ positions by the variables Z , the next $2|Y|$ positions by the variables Y (two consecutive digits for each variable), then the next $|X|$ positions are labelled by the variables X . Finally, the most significant digits form a set starting at position $M = |C| + |Y| + 2|X| + 1$.
 - For each $u \in X \cup Z$, the two corresponding items i_u and $i_{\bar{u}}$ have weights and profits $w_{i_u}, p_{i_u}, w_{i_{\bar{u}}}$ and $p_{i_{\bar{u}}}$ as described next. The weights and profits have digit 1 in the position labelled by the variable u and 0 in the positions labelled by the other variables.

If literal u appears in clause $c \in C$, then p_{i_u} and w_{i_u} have digit 1 in the position labelled as c , and 0 otherwise. Similarly, if literal $\neg u$ appears in clause $c \in C$, $p_{i_{\bar{u}}}$ and $w_{i_{\bar{u}}}$ have digit 1 in the position labelled by c , and 0 otherwise.

Finally, if $u \in X$, p_{i_u} and $p_{i_{\bar{u}}}$ have value $|Y| + 1$ in the positions from M on.

- For each variable $y \in Y$, the weights and profits of the two corresponding items i_y and $i_{\bar{y}}$ have digit 1 in the higher of the two positions labelled by y and 0 in the lower one and in the positions labelled by other variables.

The profits p_{i_y} and $p_{i_{\bar{y}}}$ also have digit 1 in position M . If literal y appears in clause $c \in C$, then p_{i_y} and w_{i_y} have digit 1 in the position labelled as c , and 0 otherwise. Similarly, if literal $\neg x$ appears in clause $c \in C$, $p_{i_{\bar{y}}}$ and $w_{i_{\bar{y}}}$ have digit 1 in the position labelled by c , and 0 otherwise.

The item j_y corresponding to y has a weight and profit with digit 2 in the highest position labelled as y .

Finally, the item j'_y has a profit with digit 1 in the lower position associated to y and a weight with a digit 1 in the higher position associated to y , with a 0 in all remaining positions.

- For each $c \in C$, the first item has weight and profit with digit 1 in the position labelled as c and 0 elsewhere, and the second item has weight and profit with digit 2 in the position labelled as c and 0 elsewhere.
- The fortification budget B_3 is set equal to $|X|$ and the attack budget B_2 to $|Y|$.
- The capacity W has 1s for all digits with labels in $Z \cup X$, 2s for all digits associated with the higher position of each label in Y , 4s for all digits with labels in C , and 0s elsewhere. Hence, I_3 can contain any I_Y item (as long as not interdicted).
- The profit goal \bar{K} has 1s for all digits with labels in U , 4s for all digits with labels in C and the decimal encoding of $(|Y|+1)|X|+|Y|$ in the digits starting at position M .

See Figure 2 for an illustration of the proposed reduction on an instance with the same overall set of variables U as before (distributed now over three subsets) and the same Boolean expression as in the example of Figure 1. The reduction is polynomial because the profit goal takes $|C|+|Z|+2|Y|+|X|+\lceil \log_{10}[(|Y|+1)|X|+|Y|] \rceil$ decimal digits and the other numbers are smaller.

Analysing an instance from the above reduction, we can infer the following properties:

Property 2.4. *The defender can reach the profit goal \bar{K} only fortifying either i_x or $i_{\bar{x}}$ for each $x \in X$.*

Proof. First of all, if the defender wants to reach the profit goal, it is mandatory to fortify $|X|$ items in I_X . Otherwise, the attacker can interdict both i_x and $i_{\bar{x}}$ for a given $x \in X$, as long as $|Y| > 1$, and forbid the defender from reaching value $(|Y|+1)|X|$ in the digits from M on, and thus the profit goal.

Consider the most significant digit whose label is in X . If the defender fortifies neither i_x nor $i_{\bar{x}}$, as stated above, the attacker can prevent the achievement of the profit goal \bar{K} . However, if both i_x and $i_{\bar{x}}$ are fortified, given the fortification budget, there is a variable $x' \in X$ with $x' \neq x$ for which neither $i_{x'}$ nor $i_{\bar{x}'}$ can be fortified: consider the one with the most significant digit position. Consequently, as explained above, the attacker will interdict both such items and the defender, being unable to select more than one I_X item for each position higher than x' , will not reach \bar{K} . The reasoning can be propagated by induction to each variable of X . \square

Property 2.5. *If the defender fortifies either i_x or $i_{\bar{x}}$ for each $x \in X$, any solution I_2 for the attacker which does not select either i_y or $i_{\bar{y}}$ for $y \in Y$ allows the defender to automatically reach the profit goal \bar{K} .*

Proof. As stated in the proof of Property 2.4, once exactly one item between i_x and $i_{\bar{x}}$ is fortified by the defender, the attacker has no incentive to attack the remaining unfortified items from I_X as: i) the defender cannot select more than the fortified items from I_X at the lowest decision level due to the structure of W ; ii) since all $|X|$ fortified items are selected at the lowest level, if the attacker does not forbid exactly $|Y|$ items from I_Y , the defender can select all uninterdicted I_Y items and achieve automatically the profit \bar{K} . For an attacker's solution which does not interdict any item from I_X , the conditions for Property 2.1 apply, which completes the proof. \square

Property 2.6. *If the defender fortifies either i_x or $i_{\bar{x}}$ for each $x \in X$ and the attacker interdicts either i_y or $i_{\bar{y}}$ for each $y \in Y$, in order to reach the profit goal \bar{K} the follower must necessarily select in I_1 the $|X|$ fortified items of I_X , the remaining $|Y|$ uninterdicted items of I_Y , all j'_y items and either i_z or $i_{\bar{z}}$ for $z \in Z$.*

Proof. In order to reach the profit goal \bar{K} , the defender must select $|X|$ items from I_X . Moreover, due to the structure of W , the choice must consist of one item between i_x and $i_{\bar{x}}$ for each $x \in X$. Indeed, one can see that for the highest X -related position, the defender must select only one item due to the budget limit. After having selected this item, the

I		M	X		Y		Z		C		
			a	b	c	d			c_1	c_2	c_3
i_a	w_{i_a}	0	1	0	0	0	0		1	0	1
	p_{i_a}	2	1	0	0	0	0		1	0	1
$i_{\bar{a}}$	$w_{i_{\bar{a}}}$	0	1	0	0	0	0		0	1	0
	$p_{i_{\bar{a}}}$	2	1	0	0	0	0		0	1	0
i_b	w_{i_b}	0	0	1	0	0	0		1	0	1
	p_{i_b}	1	0	1	0	0	0		1	0	1
$i_{\bar{b}}$	$w_{i_{\bar{b}}}$	0	0	1	0	0	0		0	1	0
	$p_{i_{\bar{b}}}$	1	0	1	0	0	0		0	1	0
j_b	w_{j_b}	0	0	2	0	0	0		0	0	0
	p_{j_b}	0	0	2	0	0	0		0	0	0
j'_b	$w_{j'_b}$	0	0	1	0	0	0		0	0	0
	$p_{j'_b}$	0	0	0	1	0	0		0	0	0
i_c	w_{i_c}	0	0	0	0	1	0		0	0	1
	p_{i_c}	0	0	0	0	1	0		0	0	1
$i_{\bar{c}}$	$w_{i_{\bar{c}}}$	0	0	0	0	1	0		1	0	1
	$p_{i_{\bar{c}}}$	0	0	0	0	1	0		1	0	1
i_d	w_{i_d}	0	0	0	0	0	1		0	1	0
	p_{i_d}	0	0	0	0	0	1		0	1	0
$i_{\bar{d}}$	$w_{i_{\bar{d}}}$	0	0	0	0	0	1		0	0	0
	$p_{i_{\bar{d}}}$	0	0	0	0	0	1		0	0	0
$i_{c_1}^1$	$w_{i_{c_1}^1}$	0	0	0	0	0	0		1	0	0
	$p_{i_{c_1}^1}$	0	0	0	0	0	0		1	0	0
$i_{c_1}^2$	$w_{i_{c_1}^2}$	0	0	0	0	0	0		2	0	0
	$p_{i_{c_1}^2}$	0	0	0	0	0	0		2	0	0
$i_{c_2}^1$	$w_{i_{c_2}^1}$	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	1	0
	$p_{i_{c_2}^1}$	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	1	0
$i_{c_2}^2$	$w_{i_{c_2}^2}$	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	2	0
	$p_{i_{c_2}^2}$	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	2	0
$i_{c_3}^1$	$w_{i_{c_3}^1}$	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	1
	$p_{i_{c_3}^1}$	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	1
$i_{c_3}^2$	$w_{i_{c_3}^2}$	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	2
	$p_{i_{c_3}^2}$	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	2
W		0	1	2	0	1	1		4	4	4
\bar{K}		3	1	1	1	1	1		4	4	4

Figure 2: Example of construction of UTIK from an instance $\mathcal{B}_3 \cap 3CNF$ with $E = (a \vee b \vee \neg c) \wedge (\neg a \vee \neg b \vee d) \wedge (a \vee c \vee b)$, where $X = \{a\}$, $Y = \{b\}$, $Z = \{c, d\}$ and the clauses are labelled from left to right.

budget for this specific column has no residual capacity and the reasoning can be applied iteratively down to the lowest X -related digit. At which point, we are in a situation where Property 2.2 can be invoked, completing the proof. \square

Theorem 2.7. *UTIK is Σ_3^P -complete.*

Proof. The statement of UTIK is of the form $\exists I_3 \forall I_2 \exists I_1 Q(I_1, I_2, I_3)$ where Q can be tested in polynomial time, directly implying that it is in Σ_3^P .

Let $\mathcal{B}_3 \cap 3CNF$ be a *Yes* instance. We form a solution to UTIK by packing in I_1 the items i_x such that $x \in X$ is 1 and the items $i_{\bar{x}}$, otherwise. Clearly, the cardinality of I_1 is equal to $|X|$. We can then apply Property 2.5 to justify that either UTIK is automatically a *Yes* instance or the attacker interdicts exactly one item between i_y and $i_{\bar{y}}$ for each $y \in Y$. At which point, the defender selects exactly one item between i_z and $i_{\bar{z}}$ in I_1 for each $z \in Z$ by virtue of Property 2.6, otherwise the instance is automatically a *No* instance. Finally, I_1 is completed by items from I_C . We can easily map any choice of set I_2 to a choice of variables Y in the SAT problem by setting a variable $y \in Y$ at 1 if item $i_{\bar{y}}$ is chosen and 0 if instead item i_y is chosen. For a given set I_2 , we can also map any set I_1 to a valid choice of variables from Z in the SAT problem. Since the $\mathcal{B}_3 \cap 3CNF$ instance is a *Yes* instance, it follows that the corresponding UTIK

instance is also a *Yes* instance, as it is possible, for any position $c \in C$, to select an item from I_U which will provide a non-zero contribution in column c , which can then be exactly upgraded to value 4 by selecting items from I_C .

Next, suppose that UTIK is a *Yes* instance. From Property 2.4 we know that I_3 must contain exactly one of the items i_x and $i_{\bar{x}}$ for each $x \in X$. It follows, by virtue of Property 2.5, that the non-trivial interdiction solution I_2 contains exactly one item between i_y and $i_{\bar{y}}$ for each $y \in Y$. Finally, by invoking Property 2.6, we know that solution I_1 contains exactly one item between i_z and $i_{\bar{z}}$ for each $z \in Z$. There is, therefore, a straightforward mapping between any non trivial I_2 and Y on the one hand and I_1 and Z on the other. Following a similar reasoning as in the UBIK proof, we conclude that the $\mathcal{B}_3 \cap 3CNF$ is a *Yes* instance. \square

2.3 Extension to any level of the polynomial hierarchy

It is possible to extend the Knapsack Interdiction game to an arbitrary number of levels. Suppose that, additionally to the lowest level, which is a regular KP, we allow for m levels above it which alternate between rounds of interdiction and fortification. The full problem is, therefore, an $(m + 1)$ -level optimisation problem, where the case with $m = 1$ is the BIKP and the case with $m = 2$ is the TIKP. If m is odd, the highest level is an interdiction round, while if m is even it is a fortification round. As in the previous subsections, we suppose that all fortification and interdiction costs are unitary. Moreover, an item which is fortified or interdicted in a certain decision round remains so in the subsequent ones and a fortified item cannot be interdicted. We formally define the following problems:

UNITARY MULTI-LEVEL INTERDICTION KNAPSACK (UMIK):

INSTANCE: A set of items I such that each $i \in I$ has a positive integer weight w_i and a positive integer profit p_i , a positive integer capacity W and a positive integer profit goal \bar{K} , as well as m positive integer budgets B_2, \dots, B_{m+1} for attack and fortification, respectively.

QUESTION: $\exists I_{m+1} \forall I_m \dots \forall I_1$ (for m even) or $\exists I_{m+1} \forall I_m \dots \exists I_1$ (for m odd) with $|I_l| \leq B_l$ for $l \geq 2$, $\sum_{i \in I_1} w_i \leq W$, $I_m \subseteq I \setminus I_{m+1}$, $I_{m-1} \subseteq I \setminus I_m, \dots, I_1 \subseteq I \setminus \bigcup_{l=1}^{\lfloor \frac{m+1}{2} \rfloor} I_{2l}$ such that $\sum_{i \in I_1} p_i \geq \bar{K}$ (if m is even) or $\sum_{i \in I_1} p_i < \bar{K}$ (if m is odd) holds?

In order to prove the Σ_{m+1}^P -completeness of the above problem, we will use the following problems, known to be Σ_{m+1}^P -complete [32, 37]:

$m + 1$ -ALTERNATING QUANTIFIED SATISFIABILITY ($\mathcal{B}_{m+1} \cap \overline{3CNF}$ with m odd, or $\mathcal{B}_{m+1} \cap 3CNF$ with m even):

INSTANCE: Disjoint non-empty sets of variables X_l for $l = 1, \dots, m + 1$, and a Boolean expression E over $\bigcup_{l=1}^{m+1} X_l$ in conjunctive normal form with at most 3 literals in each clause $c \in C$.

QUESTION: $\exists X_{m+1} \forall X_m \dots \forall X_1$: E is never satisfied? (for m odd) or $\exists X_{m+1} \forall X_m \dots \exists X_1$: E is satisfied? (for m even)

We state the following:

Theorem 2.8. *UMIK with m alternate rounds of fortification and interdiction and with unit fortification and attack costs is Σ_{m+1}^P -complete.*

Since it uses mainly ingredients introduced in the previous proofs, the proof is relegated to Appendix A.

We can make an interesting general remark regarding the UMIKP for any number of fortification and interdiction rounds:

Property 2.9. *When either the profits or the weights of the lowest-level KP become unitary, UMIKP becomes solvable in polynomial time.*

This is straightforward since any round of fortification or attack will concentrate on those items not already fortified or interdicted with either higher profit (for unit weights) or higher weights (for unit profits) so the choices at each level are straightforward. We conclude that there is therefore no intermediate situation in this regard, the problems are either complete for their natural complexity class in the polynomial hierarchy, or they become polynomial. This, of course, does not take into account the possibility of having specially structured weight or profit sets which are not simply all unitary.

3 The Max-Flow Interdiction Problem with Fortification

Given that the MFIP is the prototype of an NP-complete interdiction problem [36] and many works exist on network interdiction which are based on some kind of network flow [11, 15, 22, 33], we propose to study a fortification version of this problem which can serve as a basis for studying the complexity of flow-based fortification-interdiction problems. We therefore start this section by defining a straightforward extension of the MFIP to a fortification tri-level version and proceed to demonstrate that this problem is complete for the second level of the polynomial hierarchy, even considering unit fortification and attack costs.

The Max-Flow Interdiction Problem with Fortification The MFIPF is defined over a directed graph $G = (V, A)$, where each arc $(i, j) \in A$ is associated with a maximum capacity c_{ij} , an attack cost w_{ij} and a fortification cost b_{ij} . The aim of the defender is to maximise the amount of flow through the graph, from a source node s to a destination node t . The attacker selects a subset of arcs D to destroy, given an attack budget W (that is, $\sum_{(i,j) \in D} w_{ij} \leq W$), in order to minimise the maximum flow from s to t on the graph induced by the arc removal. Before the attack, the defender can take preventive actions that consist, given a fortification budget B , in selecting a subset of arcs F which become immune to any attack (that is, $\sum_{(i,j) \in F} b_{ij} \leq B$). The unitary version of the problem considers only unit attack and fortification costs.

Σ_2^P -completeness of the MFIPF with unit costs We now proceed to demonstrate the completeness of the MFIPF with unit costs in the second level of the polynomial hierarchy.

UNITARY MAX-FLOW INTERDICTION PROBLEM WITH FORTIFICATION (UM-FIPF):

INSTANCE: A directed graph $G = (V, A)$ with a maximum integer capacity c_{ij} for each $(i, j) \in A$, a source and a destination node $s, t \in V$, a positive integer flow goal \bar{K} and two positive integer budgets W and B for attack and fortification.

QUESTION: Is there a subset $F \subseteq A$ of arcs, with $|F| \leq B$, such that for every subset $D \subseteq A \setminus F$, with $|D| \leq W$, the value of the maximum flow from s to t in the induced graph $G_D = (V, A \setminus D)$ is at least \bar{K} ?

In order to prove the Σ_2^P -completeness of the above problem, we will use $\mathcal{B}_2 \cap 3CNF$, known to be Σ_2^P -complete [21]:

2-ALTERNATING QUANTIFIED SATISFIABILITY ($\mathcal{B}_2 \cap 3CNF$):

INSTANCE: Disjoint non-empty sets of variables X and Y , and a Boolean expression E over $U = X \cup Y$ in conjunctive normal form with at most 3 literals in each clause $c \in C$.
QUESTION: Is there a 0-1 assignment for X so that for all 0-1 assignments of Y , E is always satisfied?

The reduction from $\mathcal{B}_2 \cap 3CNF$ is obtained by the following process, that builds a four-level directed graph $G = (V, A)$, in which the first and the last level consist, respectively, of a source node s and a destination node t , while the rest of the graph connects s to t through suitable gadgets, associated with the different components of the SAT instance (variables in X and Y , and clauses). The capacity of the arcs in these gadgets are tuned so as to impose fortification and attack strategies corresponding to consistent truth assignments in the SAT instance.

- For each variable $x \in X$, we design the gadget illustrated on the left side of Figure 3. First, we introduce two nodes v_x and $v_{\bar{x}}$, and two arcs (s, v_x) and $(s, v_{\bar{x}})$. Then, we add $M = 3|Y|$ nodes, u_x^1 to u_x^M , one arc from v_x to each u_x^i with $i = 1, \dots, 2|Y|$ and one arc from $v_{\bar{x}}$ to each u_x^i with $i = |Y|+1, \dots, 3|Y|$. Finally, we add one arc from each u_x^i with $i = 1, \dots, M$ to t . We set the capacity of arcs (s, v_x) and $(s, v_{\bar{x}})$ to $c_{sv_x} = c_X + \gamma_x$ and $c_{sv_{\bar{x}}} = c_X + \gamma_{\bar{x}}$, where γ_x and $\gamma_{\bar{x}}$ are, respectively, the number of clauses of expression E in which x and \bar{x} appear, whereas c_X is a suitable large number defined and motivated in the following. The other arcs of the gadget have capacity $c_u = \frac{c_X}{2|Y|}$. By construction, the arc cut between node v_x and all nodes u_x^i has a total capacity of c_X , same as the cut between $v_{\bar{x}}$ and nodes u_x^i , while the arc cut between all nodes u_x^i and t has a total capacity of $\frac{3c_X}{2}$. The aim of this gadget is to ensure that the defender will fortify only one arc between (s, v_x) and $(s, v_{\bar{x}})$.
- For the variable subset Y , we introduce another gadget, a small significant part of which is reported on the right side of Figure 3: for each literal $(\lambda = y \text{ or } \lambda = \bar{y})$, we add a node v_λ and an arc (s, v_λ) . Then, for

each unordered pair of literals $\{\lambda, \lambda'\}$ with $\lambda \neq \lambda'$, we introduce a node $u_{\lambda\lambda'}$ along with arcs $(v_\lambda, u_{\lambda\lambda'})$ and $(v_{\lambda'}, u_{\lambda\lambda'})$. Finally, we add an arc $(u_{\lambda\lambda'}, t)$. The capacity of (s, v_λ) is $c_{sv_\lambda} = c_Y + \gamma_\lambda$, where γ_λ is defined similarly as for the X -related gadgets and c_Y is set to a suitable large number defined and motivated in the following. The arcs $(v_\lambda, u_{\lambda\lambda'})$ have capacity c'_Y , defined and motivated in the following. The arcs $(u_{\lambda\lambda'}, t)$ have capacity c'_Y if $\lambda' = \bar{\lambda}$ and $2c'_Y$ otherwise. The aim of this gadget is to force the attacker to interdict only one arc between (s, v_y) and $(s, v_{\bar{y}})$ for any $y \in Y$.

- For each clause $c \in C$, we introduce the following simple gadget: we add to V a single node v_c , with one outgoing arc to t and an incoming arc from each of the nodes v_u or $v_{\bar{u}}$ for $u \in U$ that corresponds to a literal occurring in clause c . All these arcs have capacity 1. Hence, in order to have a unitary flow from v_c to t , we need to have at least an ingoing unit of flow from the node corresponding to exactly one of the literals involved in c .
- We set the values for the following constants: the fortification budget is $B = |X|$, the attack budget $W = |X| + |Y|$, and the flow goal $\bar{K} = |X|c_X + 2|Y|(|Y|-1)c'_Y + |C|$. Finally, $c'_Y = |C| + 1$, $c_Y = (2|Y|-1)c'_Y$, $c_X = (2|Y|-1)c_Y$. These values guarantee that attacking an arc (s, v_λ) for λ an X -related literal reduces the maximum flow by at least $c_X/2$, making such an attack more profitable than $|Y|-1$ attacks on arcs from Y or C -related gadgets in the graph. This makes such arcs the most profitable to fortify or attack for both defender and attacker. The values of c_Y and c'_Y also make it much more profitable for the attacker to disable an arc (s, v_λ) with λ a Y -related literal, instead of an arc $(v_\lambda, u_{\lambda\lambda'})$ or $(u_{\lambda\lambda'}, t)$ with capacity c'_Y , or an arc of the C -related gadgets.

The structure of the graph is such that the flow from s to t is the sum of the flow through the X -related gadgets, the Y -related gadget and the C -related gadgets. Moreover, the capacities are tuned so as to guarantee that the three contributions to the total flow have different orders of magnitude, so that the second and the third one cannot compensate a nonoptimal value for the first. The reduction is obviously polynomial and does not involve any number which is exponentially large in the instance size.




Figure 3: Example of the gadget associated with a variable $x \in X$ (on the left side) and the part of the gadget associated with subset Y related to y, \bar{y} and y, y' (on the right side).

The introduced gadgets imply the following properties:

Property 3.1. *If the defender does not fortify exactly one arc between (s, v_x) and $(s, v_{\bar{x}})$ for each $x \in X$, the attacker can forbid the defender to reach the flow goal \bar{K} .*

Proof. If the defender fortifies strictly less than $|X|$ arcs (s, v_x) or $(s, v_{\bar{x}})$ in the X -related gadgets, the attacker can forbid to reach the flow goal. In fact, by interdicting at least $|X| + 1$ of such arcs, a maximum of $(|X|-1)c_X$ units of flow can pass through the X -related gadgets. Moreover, the part of the graph containing the Y and C -related gadgets allows for a maximum flow of $2|Y|c_Y + |C|$ units of flow. With $|Y| > 1$ and additional interdictions by the attacker, the total flow travelling through the rest of the graph will not be sufficient to compensate for the loss of c_X units of flow through the X -related gadgets. Therefore, the defender must spend the whole fortification budget $B = |X|$ on those arcs. If the defender does not fortify exactly one such ingoing arc for each X -related gadget, it means that in some of these gadgets, none or both ingoing arcs are fortified, because $B = |X|$. By fortifying both ingoing arcs, the defender can only hope to save an additional $c_X/2$ units of flow for this gadget, with respect to the case where only arc is fortified, given the total capacity of $\frac{3c_X}{2}$ of the rightmost arcs of the gadgets. Moreover, it leaves another

gadget completely unfortified and given that the attacker's budget is larger than $|X|$, that gadget will be completely interdicted. Hence, the defender must fortify exactly one arc in each X -related gadget, guaranteeing a minimum flow of $|X|c_X$ through such gadgets, otherwise the flow goal cannot be reached. \square

Property 3.2. *Supposing that the defender has fortified exactly one arc between (s, v_x) and $(s, v_{\bar{x}})$ for each $x \in X$, if the attacker does not disable the corresponding unfortified arcs and exactly one arc between (s, v_y) and $(s, v_{\bar{y}})$ for each $y \in Y$, the defender automatically reaches the flow goal \bar{K} .*

Proof. For each variable $x \in X$, the total flow going through the related gadget can reach a maximum of $3c_X/2$ and disabling the remaining unfortified arc between (s, v_x) and $(s, v_{\bar{x}})$ alone decreases the total flow by $c_X/2$. This is more effective than disabling any other arc in the graph. Therefore, the attacker will first spend $|X|$ units to disable those arcs. If the attacker interdicts other arcs of the X -related gadgets, the flow can only be reduced by $c_u = \frac{(2|Y|-1)c_Y}{2|Y|} < c_Y$, which is less effective than attacking an arc (s, v_y) or $(s, v_{\bar{y}})$. With the given capacities, disabling these arcs is also more effective than disabling other arcs of the Y -related gadget. Now, the maximum flow that can traverse the Y -related gadgets, if no arc is interdicted, is $[|Y|+4|Y|(|Y|-1)]c'_Y$. Interdicting an arc (s, v_λ) with $\lambda \in \{y, \bar{y}\}$ reduces this flow by c'_Y units for each arc $(v_\lambda, v_{\lambda'})$, except when $\lambda' = \bar{\lambda}$. In that case, in fact, c'_Y units of flow are forbidden only if both (s, v_λ) and $(s, v_{\bar{\lambda}})$ are disabled. Therefore, if the attacker interdicts these two arcs, swapping the interdiction of one such arc with an uninterdicted arc $(s, v_{\lambda''})$ such that $\lambda'' \neq \lambda$ and $\lambda'' \neq \bar{\lambda}$ allows to decrease the total flow from s to t by c'_Y units. Given that, when the attacker disables exactly one ingoing arc between (s, v_y) and $(s, v_{\bar{y}})$ for each $y \in Y$, the total flow through the Y gadget is equal to $2|Y|(|Y|-1)c'_Y$. Any other choice will amount to a quantity of flow that will automatically reach \bar{K} . \square

Theorem 3.3. *UMFIPF is Σ_2^P -complete.*

Proof. The statement of UMFIPF is of the form $\exists F \forall D Q(F, D)$ where Q can be tested in polyomial time since the Max-Flow Problem is in P, directly implying that it is in Σ_2^P .

Let $\mathcal{B}_2 \cap 3CNF$ be a *Yes* instance. We form a solution to UMFIPF by protecting the following arcs. For each variable $x \in X$, if $x = 1$, we fortify arc (s, v_x) by adding it in F ; otherwise, we fortify arc $(s, v_{\bar{x}})$. This obviously respects the fortification budget $B = |X|$ and allows a flow of $|X|c_X$ units through the X -related gadgets. According to Property 3.2, each attacker's solution that will not attack exactly one arc between (s, v_y) and $(s, v_{\bar{y}})$ for each $y \in Y$ ensures that the defender will reach the flow goal. It is therefore possible to generate a mapping with the second level of the $\mathcal{B}_2 \cap 3CNF$ instance as follows: for each arc (s, v_y) selected in D , assign value 0 to variable y ; if $(s, v_{\bar{y}})$ is selected in D , assign value 1 to variable y . Notice that the mapping between both problems is inverted with respect to the mapping for X variables: this is due to the fact that interdicting, say, arc (s, v_y) in UMFIPF implies that no unit of flow from that arc reach any clause node v_c for $c \in C$ which contains y , corresponding to a situation where the y variable is *false* in $\mathcal{B}_2 \cap 3CNF$. Since the $\mathcal{B}_2 \cap 3CNF$ is a *Yes* instance, any assignment of Y variables guarantees that each clause has at least one literal at value 1. Hence, for each clause $c \in C$, there is an ingoing arc for v_c corresponding to a literal $\lambda = u$ or \bar{u} for some $u \in U$ which is true in $\mathcal{B}_2 \cap 3CNF$. Given the way we have built our reduction, a non-zero flow can circulate through this arc. Given the capacity of the arc (s, v_λ) , we can make a unit of flow circulate on arc (v_λ, v_c) and then on arc (v_c, t) . We can therefore add one unit of flow per clause, that is $|C|$ overall, and reach the flow goal \bar{K} , and our UMFIPF instance is a *Yes* instance.

Conversely, let UMFIPF be a *Yes* instance. According to Property 3.1, the fortification budget of the defender needs to be spent on arcs (s, v_x) and $(s, v_{\bar{x}})$ for $x \in X$ and exactly one such arc needs to be fortified for each $x \in X$. Using Property 3.2, the best strategy for the attacker is to interdict exactly one arc between (s, v_y) and $(s, v_{\bar{y}})$ for each variable $y \in Y$. We can therefore adopt a mapping such that for each $x \in X$, $x = 1$ if (s, v_x) is fortified and 0 otherwise, and for each $y \in Y$, $y = 0$ if (s, v_y) is interdicted and 1 otherwise. Since the UMFIPF is a *Yes* instance, and the flow going through all of the X and Y gadgets going directly to node t is equal to $|X|c_X + 2|Y|(|Y|-1)c'_Y$, it means that one unit of flow has to go through each of the clause gadgets. Since this flow comes from the v_u or $v_{\bar{u}}$ nodes, it means that for each clause $c \in C$, a corresponding literal is equal to one and the $\mathcal{B}_2 \cap 3CNF$ is a *Yes* instance. \square

4 The Shortest Path Interdiction Problem with Fortification

The SPIP is a classic network interdiction problem which has been tackled under many different forms, ranging from the most basic one [20] to more refined versions with uncertain and asymmetric information [29]. It is formulated on a directed graph with a given source node and destination node, and consists in an attacker selecting a subset of arcs subject to a certain attack budget, in order to maximise the length of the shortest path that a defender can find from the

source to the destination. The fortification version of this problem, where the defender can take preventive actions by fortifying a subset of arcs subject to a fortification budget, is considered as a basic problem in fortification-interdiction games and has been used as an example problem for applying generic tri-level fortification algorithmic frameworks in several works [24, 26]. The version advocated in such works is usually one with unit fortification and attack costs. In this section, we will first present the general SPIP with Fortification (SPIPF), then we will prove the Σ_2^p -completeness of a version of SPIPF with unit fortification costs.

Problem definition The SPIPF is defined over a directed graph $G = (V, A)$, where each arc $(i, j) \in A$ is associated with a length d_{ij} , an attack cost w_{ij} and a fortification cost b_{ij} . The aim of the defender is to find a path of minimum length between a source node s and a destination node t . The attacker seeks to interdict a set of arcs D , given a maximum attack budget W' (i.e., $\sum_{(i,j) \in D} w_{ij} \leq W'$), in order to maximise the length of the shortest path on the graph induced by the arc removal. Before the attacker operates, the defender can take preventive actions to fortify a subset of arcs F , which become immune to any attack, given a maximum fortification budget B' (i.e., $\sum_{(i,j) \in F} b_{ij} \leq B'$). The unitary version of that problem considers only unit fortification costs, but arbitrary attack costs.

SHORTEST PATH INTERDICTION PROBLEM WITH UNITARY FORTIFICATION (SPIPUF):

INSTANCE: A directed graph $G = (V, A)$ with an integer length d_{ij} and an attack cost w_{ij} for each $(i, j) \in A$, a source and destination node $s, t \in V$, two positive integer budgets W' and B' and a positive integer goal \bar{K}' .

QUESTION: Is there a subset $F \subseteq A$ of arcs, with $|F| \leq B'$, such that for every subset $D \subseteq A \setminus F$, with $\sum_{(i,j) \in D} w_{ij} \leq W'$, the length of the shortest path from s to t in the induced graph $G_D = (V, A \setminus D)$ is strictly less than \bar{K}' ?

Σ_2^p -completeness of SPIPF with unit fortification costs We now proceed to demonstrate the Σ_2^p -completeness of the SPIPF with unit fortification costs. To this purpose, we will use UBIK, demonstrated to be in the second level of the polynomial hierarchy in Section 2.

Theorem 4.1. *SPIPUF is Σ_2^p -complete.*

Proof. The statement of SPIPUF is of the form $\exists F \forall D \ Q(F, D)$, where Q can be tested in polynomial time, since the Shortest Path Problem is in P, directly implying that SPIPUF is in Σ_2^p .

Let us introduce the following reduction from UBIK:

- We label each of the items in UBIK with a number from 1 to $n = |I|$.
- We introduce in set V a node v_k for each item $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and a source node v_0 ; node v_n will serve as destination node.
- For each item $i \in I = \{1, \dots, n\}$, we introduce the following gadget: add an arc (v_{i-1}, v_i) with length $p_i + 2$ and attack cost $W + 1$, a node v'_i and arcs (v_{i-1}, v'_i) with length 1 and attack cost w_i and (v'_i, v_i) with length 1 and attack cost $W + 1$.
- We set the fortification budget B' to B_2 , i.e. the value of the attack budget in UBIK, the attack budget W' to W , i.e. the value of the weight capacity of UBIK, and the goal for the shortest path length to $\bar{K}' = \bar{K} + 2n$. By construction, therefore, only the arcs (v_{i-1}, v'_i) can be attacked, and only within the capacity of the knapsack.

We provide a graphical view of the reduction in Figure 4. Notice that the defender and the attacker adopt a reverse perspective in the two problems: fortifying arcs in SPIPUF corresponds to interdicting items in UBIK, and attacking arcs in SPIPUF to selecting items in UBIK. In fact, the rationale is to solve the KP by minimising the total profit of the items not selected.

Let UBIK be a *Yes* instance. We form a solution to SPIPUF as follows: if item $i \in I$ is interdicted by the attacker in UBIK, we fortify the arc (v_{i-1}, v'_i) , after which no more fortification budget remains. Now the attacker in SPIPUF can attack only the unfortified arcs (v_{i-1}, v'_i) with $i = 1, \dots, n$. For each set of attacked arcs D , the shortest path from v_0 to v_n is easily determined: for each $i = 1, \dots, n$, if arc (v_{i-1}, v'_i) is attacked, the defender has to use arc (v_{i-1}, v_i) with length $p_i + 2$; otherwise, the defender will use arcs (v_{i-1}, v'_i) and (v'_i, v_i) with total length 2. The worst case occurs when the attacker selects the attacked arcs (v_{i-1}, v'_i) so that the sum of the profits p_i on the alternative arcs (v_{i-1}, v_i) is maximum. Since for each $i = 1, \dots, n$ we either travel a length 2 or $p_i + 2$ (if an arc is interdicted in the associated gadget), the interdiction of an arc (v_{i-1}, v'_i) in SPIPUF corresponds to the selection of an item in UBIK. Since UBIK is a *Yes* instance, we cannot achieve a profit of \bar{K} or more; hence, the shortest path length cannot reach $\bar{K} + 2n$. Therefore, the SPIPUF is a *Yes* instance.




Figure 4: Example of the graph obtained after reducing to SPIPUF. The label for each arc provides the length and the attack cost of the arc.

Conversely, assume that the SPIPUF is a *Yes* instance. Only the arcs (v_{i-1}, v'_i) for $i = 1, \dots, n$ are worth fortifying, since the other ones cannot be interdicted respecting the budget. Given a solution to SPIPUF, we can right away map the fortified arcs onto the corresponding items of UBIK. Since SPIPUF is a *Yes* instance, the attacker cannot interdict a set of (v_{i-1}, v'_i) arcs that at the same time has a total attack budget not larger than W and increases the shortest path length by at least \bar{K} . Mapping any set of interdicted arcs to the corresponding items in UBIK, we have that no item selection in UBIK can reach the profit goal \bar{K} and UBIK is a *Yes* instance, which completes the proof. \square

5 Multi-level Critical Node Problem with unit weights

In this section, we first recall the formal definition of the MCNP with unit weights, which is defined in [4] as a three-level problem, after which we proceed to demonstrate its Σ_3^P -completeness.

Multi-level Critical Node Problem The MCNP is defined on an undirected graph $G = (V, A)$. First, the defender selects a subset of vertices $D \subseteq V$ to *vaccinate*, subject to a vaccination budget Ω and weight \hat{c}_v for each $v \in V$. Then, the attacker selects a subset of vertices $I \subseteq V \setminus D$ to (directly) *infect*, subject to an infection budget Φ and weight h_v for $v \in V$. Finally, the defender selects a subset of vertices $P \subseteq V \setminus I$ to *protect*, subject to a protection budget Λ and weight c_v for $v \in V$. A directly or indirectly infected vertex v propagates the infection to a vertex u , if $(v, u) \in A$ and u is neither vaccinated nor protected. The goal of the defender is to maximise the benefit b_v of saved vertices (*i.e.*, not infected), while the attacker aims to minimise it. We assume that all parameters of the problem are non-negative integers.

The game description can be succinctly given by the following mixed integer trilevel program:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (MCN) \quad & \max_{z \in \{0,1\}^{|V|}} \min_{y \in \{0,1\}^{|V|}} \max_{\substack{x \in \{0,1\}^{|V|} \\ \alpha \in [0,1]^{|V|}}} \sum_{v \in V} b_v \alpha_v \\
 & \sum_{v \in V} \hat{c}_v z_v \leq \Omega \quad \sum_{v \in V} h_v y_v \leq \Phi \\
 & s.t. \quad \sum_{v \in V} c_v x_v \leq \Lambda \\
 & \alpha_v \leq 1 + z_v - y_v, \quad \forall v \in V \quad (1a) \\
 & \alpha_v \leq \alpha_u + x_v + z_v, \quad \forall (u, v) \in A, \quad (1b)
 \end{aligned}$$

where z , y , x and α are binary decision vectors whose coordinates are z_v , y_v , x_v and α_v for each $v \in V$. In this optimisation model, z , y and x reflect the set of vaccinated vertices $D = \{v \in V : z_v = 1\}$, directly infected vertices $I = \{v \in V : y_v = 1\}$ and protected vertices $P = \{v \in V : x_v = 1\}$, respectively. Finally, α mimics the propagation of the infection among the vertices in V , through Constraints (1a) and (1b). Concretely, $\alpha_v = 1$ means that vertex v is saved and $\alpha_v = 0$ means that vertex v is infected. See [4] for further details on this mathematical programming formulation and Figure 5 for an illustration of the game.




Figure 5: Example of an MCN game with unitary weights and benefits, and budgets $\Omega = \Phi = \Lambda = 1$. At the end of the game, vertices $\{v_1, v_3, v_4\}$ are saved and $\{v_2, v_6, v_5\}$ are infected.

We recall that this problem was proved to be Σ_3^P -complete on trees, with arbitrary integer weights, in [28]. In the following we will concentrate on the unweighted version, tackled numerically in [4], for which all the weights previously described are unitary.

Σ_3^P -completeness of the MCNP with unit weights We now demonstrate the completeness of the MCNP with unit weights for the third level of the polynomial hierarchy. This version of the MCNP is defined as:

UNITARY MULTI-LEVEL CRITICAL NODE (UMCN):

INSTANCE: An undirected graph $G = (V, A)$, three positive integer maximum cardinalities Ω , Φ and Λ and a positive integer goal \bar{K} .

QUESTION: Is there a subset $D \subseteq V$ of vertices, with $|D| \leq \Omega$, such that for every subset $I \subseteq V \setminus D$, with $|I| \leq \Phi$, there is a subset $P \subseteq V \setminus I$, with $|P| \leq \Lambda$, such that the cardinality of the saved vertices is at least \bar{K} ?

In order to prove the Σ_3^P -completeness of the above problem, we will use $\mathcal{B}_3 \cap 3CNF$ as in Section 2.

Let us introduce the following reduction from the $\mathcal{B}_3 \cap 3CNF$:

- For each literal $\lambda = u$ or $\lambda = \bar{u}$ with $u \in U$, we introduce in the graph a vertex v_λ . We also define $V_X = \{v_x, v_{\bar{x}} : x \in X\}$, $V_Y = \{v_y, v_{\bar{y}} : y \in Y\}$ and $V_Z = \{v_z, v_{\bar{z}} : z \in Z\}$.
- For each unordered pair of literals $\{\lambda, \lambda'\}$ with $\lambda, \lambda' \in \{x, \bar{x}\}$, $\lambda \neq \lambda'$ and $x \in X$, we add a gadget (see the left part of Figure 6), composed by a set $C_{\lambda\lambda'}$ of Γ_X vertices, all connected with v_λ and $v_{\lambda'}$. The cardinality Γ_X is suitably defined in the following. The aim of these gadgets is to turn each couple of vertices from V_X into a vertex cut, so that protecting both vertices allows to save $C_{\lambda\lambda'}$. Since this does not hold for the couple of vertices $(v_x, v_{\bar{x}})$ for each $x \in X$, it will be effective to protect only one vertex from such couples.
- For each literal $\lambda = y$ or $\lambda = \bar{y}$ with $y \in Y$, we introduce a set S_λ of Γ_Y vertices, each with an edge linking it to v_λ . Therefore, v_y and $v_{\bar{y}}$ are at the centre of a substar inside the graph. We also introduce a set K_y of Γ_Y vertices, all linked to both v_y and $v_{\bar{y}}$. The value of Γ_Y is defined in the following. We provide a graphic illustration of such a gadget in the central part of Figure 6.
- We add edges between each vertex of $V_X \cup V_Z$ and each vertex of V_Y .
- For each unordered pair of literals $\{\lambda, \lambda'\}$ with $\lambda, \lambda' \in \{z, \bar{z}\}$ with $z \in Z$, $\lambda \neq \lambda'$ and $\lambda \neq \bar{\lambda}'$, we introduce a set $C_{\lambda\lambda'}$ of Γ_Z vertices, all connected with v_λ and $v_{\lambda'}$. The cardinality Γ_Z is suitably defined in the following. The aim of this set of gadgets is once again to allow each couple of vertices from V_Z to be part of a vertex cut, so that protecting both vertices allows to save $C_{\lambda\lambda'}$. Since this does not hold for the couple of vertices $(v_z, v_{\bar{z}})$ for each $z \in Z$, it will be effective to protect only one vertex from such couples.
- For each clause $c \in C$, let $k_c \leq 3$ be the number of literals included in the clause. We enumerate the $2^{k_c} - 1$ variable assignments that satisfy the clause (excluding only the one which negates all literals) and introduce a vertex v_c^i (with $i = 1, \dots, 2^{k_c} - 1$) for each corresponding set of literals. We define as V_C the set of all such vertices. These vertices are connected by edges to the corresponding vertices in V_X , V_Y and V_Z .

The aim of these gadgets is to guarantee that exactly one of the vertices in each clause gadget will be saved if at least one of the vertices associated to the literals is vaccinated or protected, and no vertex is saved otherwise. We provide a graphic illustration of such a gadget in the right part of Figure 6.

- We set the vaccination budget as $\Omega = |X|$, the infection budget as $\Phi = |X| + |Y|$ and the protection budget as $\Lambda = |Y| + |Z|$. We set the profit goal at $\bar{K} = \Gamma_X |X|(|X|-1)/2 + |X| + |Y|(\Gamma_Y + 1) + \Gamma_Z |Z|(|Z|-1)/2 + |Z| + |C|$. Finally, we set $\Gamma_Z = |C| + 1$, $\Gamma_Y = \Gamma_Z |Z|(|Z|-1)/2 + 1$ and $\Gamma_X = 4|Y|\Gamma_Y + 1$. This guarantees that it is more advantageous to save or infect (from the point of view of the defender or the attacker, respectively) vertices from V_X first, from V_Y second, and lastly from V_Z .




Figure 6: On the left part: example of a gadget between the vertices associated to two variables $x, x' \in X$ (which forms a bi-partite graph). The black dots denote the rest of the sets elliptically. On the middle part: example of a gadget associated to a variable $y \in Y$. The black dots denote the rest of the sets elliptically. On the right part: example of a gadget associated to a clause $c = x \wedge y \wedge \neg z$ with $x \in X, y \in Y$ and $z \in Z$. The only missing configuration on the right is the one of the negation of the clause, i.e., $\neg x \wedge \neg y \wedge z$, therefore in the case this expression is true in the SAT instance, no vertex on the right is saved from infection.

The reduction is polynomial because the number of vertices and edges of the graph is polynomial in the instance size.

We proceed to prove some useful properties about the solutions to MCNP instances created above:

Property 5.1. *In every Yes instance of UMCN, the defender must vaccinate either vertex v_x or $v_{\bar{x}}$ for each $x \in X$ in order to reach the profit goal.*

Proof. First of all, notice that, once a vertex $v_\lambda \in V_X \cup V_Y \cup V_Z$ is infected, the only way for the defender to save the vertices from the sets $C_{\lambda\lambda'}$ or S_λ or the ones in V_C that correspond to truth assignments using λ is to vaccinate or protect them individually. This is ineffective when compared to the vaccination or protection of vertices from V_X , V_Y and V_Z , that indirectly save also the adjacent vertices. Second, with the given Γ parameters and in order to reach the profit goal, the defender must save at least $|X|(|X|-1)/2$ subsets $C_{\lambda\lambda'}$ of Γ_X vertices by spending the whole vaccination budget on V_X . Otherwise, the attacker can infect $|X|+1$ vertices from V_X directly, and the corresponding subsets $C_{\lambda\lambda'}$ indirectly. Moreover, if the defender does not vaccinate exactly one vertex between v_x and $v_{\bar{x}}$ for each $x \in X$, then some couples are completely vaccinated while others have both vertices unvaccinated, and therefore prone to infection. By construction, since the pairs $(v_x, v_{\bar{x}})$ do not have a corresponding C subset, the number of saved subsets $C_{\lambda\lambda'}$ is strictly less than $|X|(|X|-1)/2$ and the profit goal \bar{K} cannot be reached. \square

Property 5.2. *If the defender vaccinates exactly one vertex for each pair in V_X and the attacker does not infect exactly one vertex for each pair in V_Y , the defender can always reach the profit goal.*

Proof. If the defender vaccinates exactly one vertex for each pair in V_X , the attacker must infect all unvaccinated V_X vertices. Otherwise, the defender will save at least $\Gamma_X|X|(|X|+1)/2 > \bar{K}$ vertices. With the remaining $|Y|$ units of attack, infecting a vertex from the $C_{\lambda\lambda'}$ set for literals λ and λ' of X only infects this single vertex (a similar reasoning applies to the vertices of the S_λ and K_y sets, as well as the $C_{\lambda\lambda'}$ sets for λ and λ' being Z -related literals). Moreover, this attack would leave a remaining budget of $|Y|-1$ vertices. From the remaining vertices of the graph, those of V_Y are the ones with the largest number of adjacent nodes that can easily be saved by protecting a vertex in V_Y . Consequently, the defender can use $|Y|+1$ units from the protection budget to protect $|Y|+1$ vertices from V_Y to obtain a number of saved vertices greater than $\Gamma_X|X|(|X|-1)/2 + |X|+\Gamma_Y(|Y|+2) > \bar{K}$.

Moreover, the attacker must infect either vertex v_y or $v_{\bar{y}}$ for each $y \in Y$. Otherwise, there exists $y \in Y$ such that neither v_y nor $v_{\bar{y}}$ are directly infected. Since the defender has enough budget to protect the $|Y|$ vertices of V_Y not infected, both v_y and $v_{\bar{y}}$ can be protected, saving the stars around the two vertices and the set K_y linked to both vertices. This generates a number of saved vertices larger than $\Gamma_X|X|(|X|-1)/2 + |X|+\Gamma_Y(|Y|+2) > \bar{K}$, which completes the proof. \square

Property 5.3. *If the defender vaccinates either vertex v_x or $v_{\bar{x}}$ for each $x \in X$, and the attacker infects either vertex v_y or $v_{\bar{y}}$ for each $y \in Y$, the defender can reach the profit goal only by protecting all the uninfected vertices from V_Y and either vertex v_z or $v_{\bar{z}}$ for each $z \in Z$.*

Proof. Consider a vaccination and infection solution as described in the statement above. The defender must protect all the non-infected vertices of V_Y , otherwise the profit will be $\leq \Gamma_X|X|(|X|-1)/2 + |X|+\Gamma_Y(|Y|+1) < \bar{K}$. With the remaining protection budget of $|Z|$ units, defending vertices from the subsets C , S or K subsets that are linked to an infected vertex is unfavourable, since doing so only saves the protected vertex. The defender would then have less than $|Z|$ remaining units to protect vertices from V_Z and the number of saved vertices will be less than $\Gamma_X|X|(|X|-1)/2 + |X|+\Gamma_Y(|Y|+1) + \Gamma_Z(|Z|-1)(|Z|-2)/2 + |Z|+|C| < \bar{K}$.

The defender will then protect exactly $|Z|$ vertices from set V_Z . Following the reasoning of Property 5.1, protecting both vertices v_z and $v_{\bar{z}}$ for a given $z \in Z$ is ineffective. Therefore, the defender will protect exactly one v vertex for each $z \in Z$. \square

Theorem 5.4. *UMCN is Σ_3^P -complete.*

Proof. Given the form of the problem, UMCN is straightforwardly in Σ_3^P .

Let $\mathcal{B}_3 \cap 3CNF$ be a *Yes* instance. We form a solution to UMCN by selecting in D the vertices v_x such that $x \in X$ is 1 and the vertices $v_{\bar{x}}$ otherwise. Given Properties 5.2 and 5.3, the attacker's solutions which do not make the profit \bar{K} trivially reachable by the defender are those that infect exactly one vertex between v_y and $v_{\bar{y}}$ for each $y \in Y$. Moreover, the defender's solutions that allow the defender to reach profit \bar{K} are those for which the defender protects either vertex v_z or $v_{\bar{z}}$ for each $z \in Z$. Therefore, any variable assignment of $\mathcal{B}_3 \cap 3CNF$ can be mapped to a solution of UMCN which does not automatically reach the profit goal: for any $y \in Y$ assigned a value 0 (and only those), assign v_y to infection set I (i.e., infect it) and then let the defender protect the remaining vertices of V_Y ; for any $z \in Z$ assigned value 1 (and only those), assign v_z to protection set P . Since the $\mathcal{B}_3 \cap 3CNF$ instance is a *Yes* instance, for each clause, at least one of the vertices corresponding to the literals is vaccinated or protected. Therefore, one of the vertices corresponding to the clause is saved (the one connected by an edge to the three vertices associated to the literal which is true in the SAT instance), which guarantees that the defender can reach the profit goal \bar{K} and UMCN is a *Yes* instance.

Next, suppose that UMCN is a *Yes* instance. According to Property 5.1, the set D must contain exactly one of the vertices v_x and $v_{\bar{x}}$ for $x \in X$. Given such a set D , we can construct a solution for $\mathcal{B}_3 \cap 3CNF$ where, for each $x \in X$, we assign 1 to x if $v_x \in D$ and 0 otherwise. For each assignment of the variables of set Y in the SAT instance, we consider an attacker's solution where for each $y \in Y$, we assign 0 to y if $y \in I$ and 1 otherwise. Given Property 5.3, each lower level reaction of the defender protects exactly one vertex between v_z and $v_{\bar{z}}$ for each $z \in Z$. Therefore we can map this solution to a SAT solution where for each $z \in Z$, we assign 1 to z if $v_z \in P$ and 0 otherwise. Since UMCN is a *Yes* instance, in addition to the set of $\Gamma_X|X|(|X|-1)/2 + |X|+|Y|(\Gamma_Y+1) + \Gamma_Z|Z|(|Z|-1)/2 + |Z|$ vertices saved directly by the defender's selection, it needs to save one vertex per clause of C (and exactly that amount since for each clause, a maximum of one vertex can be saved). Therefore, one of the literals of each clause needs to be assigned the value 1, ensuring that the $\mathcal{B}_3 \cap 3CNF$ is a *Yes* instance, which completes the proof. \square

Compared to the proof proposed in [28], which reduced the TIKP to the MCNP over trees, the reduction proposed here is based on graphs with a more complex topology. This topology is dictated, like the reduction presented earlier for the Interdiction Knapsack, by the need to make the nodes from, e.g., V_X more interesting to focus on for both players. This type of construction is recurrent in all our proofs relying on multi-level SAT problems, due to the symmetry of the decisions for the higher levels because of the equality of all fortification and attack costs, as can be seen also in the reduction used to prove the Σ_2^P -completeness of the MFIPF in the previous section.

6 Conclusion

Over the years, the literature about interdiction problems with fortification has built slowly but steadily, yet until recently [28], no completeness result for such tri-level problems was rigorously proved. In this work, we provided proofs clarifying the position of several fortification problems in the polynomial hierarchy. Since such problems are usually computationally tackled with unit fortification and attack costs, we have provided reductions that assume unit fortification costs and, whenever possible, also unit attack costs, refining on the previous results of [28]. We investigated problems whose structure may prove useful in the future in clarifying the complexity of other fortification problems. For example, we considered the Multi-level Interdiction Knapsack Problem, which we proved to be complete for any level of the polynomial hierarchy when one allows for an arbitrary number of fortification-interdiction rounds, or the Max-Flow Interdiction Problem with Fortification, which we proved to be Σ_2^P -complete. Using our result on the Bi-level Interdiction Knapsack Problem, we have proved that some well-studied fortification problems, such as the Shortest Path Interdiction Problem with Fortification or a well-known Tri-level Electric Power Grid Fortification Problem, are Σ_2^P -complete. Finally, we refined a result of [28] by showing that the Multi-level Critical Node Problem is Σ_3^P -complete even with unit weights and profits.

Further investigation on the computational complexity of these problems can take several forms. The study of the Multi-level Interdiction KP is interesting as the problem does not have much structure, differently from a network interdiction-fortification problem. This fact makes it easier to use it for deriving the completeness of other interdiction-fortification problems, similar to what is done in Section 4 and Appendix B. Moreover, it is interesting that even with unit fortification and interdiction costs, the problem complexity remains the same, as long as the lowest level weights and profits are arbitrary, whereas if either these weights or profits become unitary, no matter the number of interdiction-fortification rounds, the problem collapses to P. An interesting avenue of research would be to try to find out a special structure of the lowest level weights and/or profits that would decrease the problem complexity without rendering it polynomial. Alternatively, if one of the lowest level sets of weights and profits becomes unitary (so that the lowest level KP becomes polynomial), what is the complexity of the problem when at least one set of higher level costs is instead arbitrary? Such clarifications may help to understand the articulation of the different levels which defines the intrinsic complexity of higher level problems in the polynomial hierarchy. Another interesting subject is the status of specially structured instances of problems formulated on undirected graphs, such as the Multi-level Critical Node Problem with unit weights and profits: while the weighted counterpart has been proved to be Σ_3^P -complete even for the simple case of trees, the reduction used in this work for the unweighted case uses far more structured graphs. Since the lower level of this problem becomes polynomial over trees [28], it would be interesting to investigate the full unweighted tri-level problem on specially structured graphs. Finally, exploring the complexity of other existing fortification problems or clarifying the case of the SPIPF or TEPGFP with unit fortification and attack costs could be a worthy goal. We also underline that other interdiction-protection problems exist which do not rely strictly on fortification as a protection mechanism, see e.g. [5], and that the results obtained in this work may be of help in the study of their computational complexity.

References

- [1] Bernardetta Addis, Marco Di Summa, and Andrea Grosso. Identifying critical nodes in undirected graphs: Complexity results and polynomial algorithms for the case of bounded treewidth. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 161(16):2349–2360, Nov 2013.
- [2] Ashwin Arulselvan, Clayton W. Commander, Lily Eleftheriadou, and Panos M. Pardalos. Detecting critical nodes in sparse graphs. *Computers & Operations Research*, 36(7):2193–2200, 2009.
- [3] Nikitas Assimakopoulos. A network interdiction model for hospital infection control. *Computers in Biology and Medicine*, 17(6):413–422, 1987.
- [4] Andrea Baggio, Margarida Carvalho, Andrea Lodi, and Andrea Tramontani. Multilevel approaches for the critical node problem. *Operations Research*, 69:486–508, 2021.
- [5] Fábio Barbosa, Agostinho Agra, and Amaro de Sousa. The minimum cost network upgrade problem with maximum robustness to multiple node failures. *Computers & Operations Research*, 136:105453, 2021.

- [6] Gerald Brown, Matt Carlyle, Javier Salmerón, and R. Kevin Wood. Defending critical infrastructure. *Interfaces*, 36:530–544, 12 2006.
- [7] A. Caprara, M. Carvalho, A. Lodi, and G. J. Woeginger. Bilevel knapsack with interdiction constraints. *INFORMS Journal on Computing*, 28:319–333, 2016.
- [8] Alberto Caprara, Margarida Carvalho, Andrea Lodi, and Gerhard J. Woeginger. A study on the computational complexity of the bilevel knapsack problem. *SIAM Journal of Optimization*, 24:823–838, 2014.
- [9] F. Chen, R. Wang, Z. Xu, H. Liu, and M. Wang. A quantified multi-stage optimization method for resource allocation of electric grid defense planning. *Electric Power Systems Research*, 220:109284, 2023.
- [10] Thomas H. Cormen, Charles E. Leiserson, Ronald L. Rivest, and Clifford Stein. *Introduction to Algorithms, Third Edition*. The MIT Press, 3rd edition, 2009.
- [11] K. J. Cormican, D. P. Morton, and R. K. Wood. Stochastic network interdiction. *Operations Research*, 46:184–197, 1998.
- [12] A. Delgadillo, J. M. Arroyo, and N. Alguacil. Analysis of electric grid interdiction with line switching. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, 25:633–641, 2010.
- [13] Federico Della Croce and Rosario Scatamacchia. An exact approach for the bilevel knapsack problem with interdiction constraints and extensions. *Mathematical Programming*, 183:249–281, 2020.
- [14] Scott DeNegre. *Interdiction and Discrete Bilevel Linear Programming*. PhD thesis, Lehigh University, 2011.
- [15] F. Enayaty-Ahangar, C. E. Rainwater, and T. C. Sharkey. A logic-based decomposition approach for multi-period network interdiction models. *Omega*, 87:71–85, 2019.
- [16] Ramy Fakhri, Elkafi Hassini, Mohamed Ezzeldin, and Wael El-Dakhakhni. Tri-level mixed-binary linear programming: Solution approaches and application in defending critical infrastructure. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 298:1114–1131, 2022.
- [17] Nicolas Fröhlich and Stefan Ruzika. On the hardness of covering-interdiction problems. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 871:1–15, 2021.
- [18] Fabio Furini, Ivana Ljubic, Sebastien Martin, and Pablo San Segundo. The maximum clique interdiction problem. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 277:112–127, 02 2019.
- [19] M. Goerigk, S. Lendl, and L. Wulf. On the complexity of robust multi-stage problems with discrete recourse. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 343:355–370, 2024.
- [20] E. Israeli and R. K. Wood. Shortest-path network interdiction. *Networks*, 40(2):97–111, 2002.
- [21] Berit Johannes. *New Classes of Complete Problems for the Second Level of the Polynomial Hierarchy*. PhD thesis, Technischen Universität Berlin, 2011.
- [22] E. Kuttler, N. Ghorbani-Renani, K. Barker, and A. D. González. Protection-interdiction-restoration for resilient multi-commodity networks. *Reliability Engineering and System Safety*, 242:109745, 2024.
- [23] Mohammed Lalou, Mohammed Amin Tahraoui, and Hamamache Kheddouci. The critical node detection problem in networks: A survey. *Computer Science Review*, 28:92–117, 2018.
- [24] Markus Leitner, Ivana Ljubić, Michele Monaci, Markus Sinnl, and Kübra Tanınmış. An exact method for binary fortification games. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 307(3):1026–1039, 2023.
- [25] L. Lozano, J. C. Smith, and M. E. Kurz. The traveling salesman problem with interdiction and fortification. *Annals of Operations Research*, 45:210–216, 2017.
- [26] Leonardo Lozano and J. Cole Smith. A backward sampling framework for interdiction problems with fortification. *INFORMS Journal on Computing*, 29:123–139, 2017.
- [27] Ajay Malaviya, Chase Rainwater, and Thomas Sharkey. Multi-period network interdiction problems with applications to city-level drug enforcement. *IIE Transactions*, 44(5):368–380, 2012.
- [28] Adel Nabli, Margarida Carvalho, and Pierre Hosteins. Complexity of the multilevel critical node problem. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 127:122–145, 2022.
- [29] D. H. Nguyen and J. C. Smith. Asymmetric stochastic shortest-path interdiction under conditional value-at-risk. *IIE Transactions*, 56:398–410, 2024.

- [30] J. Salmeron, K. Wood, and R. Baldick. Analysis of electric grid security under terrorist threat. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, 19:905–912, 2004.
- [31] J. Salmeron, K. Wood, and R. Baldick. Worst-case interdiction analysis of large-scale electric power grids. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, 24:96–104, 2009.
- [32] Larry J. Stockmeyer. The polynomial-time hierarchy. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 3(1):1–22, Oct 1976.
- [33] K. M. Sullivan and J. C. Smith. Exact algorithms for solving a euclidean maximum flow network interdiction problem. *Navigation, Journal of the Institute of Navigation*, 64:109–124, 2014.
- [34] Kelly M. Sullivan, David P. Morton, Feng Pan, and J. Cole Smith. Securing a border under asymmetric information. *Naval Research Logistics (NRL)*, 61(2):91–100, 2014.
- [35] Noah Weninger and Ricardo Fukasawa. A fast combinatorial algorithm for the bilevel knapsack problem with interdiction constraints. In Alberto Del Pia and Volker Kaibel, editors, *Integer Programming and Combinatorial Optimization*, pages 438–452, Cham, 2023. Springer International Publishing.
- [36] R. Kevin Wood. Deterministic network interdiction. *Mathematical and Computer Modelling*, 17(2):1–18, Jan 1993.
- [37] Celia Wrathall. Complete sets and the polynomial-time hierarchy. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 3(1):23–33, Oct 1976.
- [38] Xuan Wu and Antonio J. Conejo. An efficient tri-level optimization model for electric grid defense planning. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, 32:2984–2994, 2017.
- [39] Yipeng Wu, Zhilong Chen, Huadong Gong, Qilin Feng, Yicun Chen, and Haizhou Tang. Defender-attacker-operator: Tri-level game-theoretic interdiction analysis of urban water distribution networks. *Reliability Engineering and System Safety*, 214:107703, 2021.

Appendix A Proof the Σ_3^P -completeness of the Unitary Multi-level Interdiction Knapsack

We provide here the proof of Theorem 2.8.

Proof. Starting from an instance of $\mathcal{B}_{m+1} \cap \overline{3CNF}$ (if m odd), or $\mathcal{B}_{m+1} \cap 3CNF$ (if m even), we construct an instance of UMIK as follows:

- For each variable $u \in U$, we create two items i_u and $i_{\bar{u}}$, one for each possible 0-1 assignment of u . We define $I_{X_l} = \{i_x, i_{\bar{x}} : x \in X_l\}$ with $l = 1, \dots, m+1$. For variables of each interdiction level $x \in X_l$ with l an even number, we introduce a third item j_x and a fourth item j'_x , which will serve to force the attacker to choose one and only one item between i_x and $i_{\bar{x}}$ and the defender to consume the knapsack capacity completely.
- For each clause $c \in C$, we create two items i_c^1, i_c^2 . We designate by I_C the set of items associated with C .
- Weights, profits, maximum capacities, maximum profit and goal will be given by positive integer numbers expressed in base 10. Each digit position is labelled by a variable or a clause: the first $|C|$ positions (least significant numbers) are labelled by the clauses; the next $|X_1|$ positions are labelled by the variables X_1 , the next $2|X_2|$ positions are labelled by the variables X_2 , etc... until the next $2|X_{m+1}|$ positions, if m is odd, or $|X_{m+1}|$ positions, if m is even, which are labelled by the variables X_{m+1} ; finally, the last (highest) positions are labelled from M on.

- All items have attack and fortification costs equal to 1 (*i.e.*, unitary costs).
- For each level with an odd index l , that is for all fortification levels and for the regular KP on the lowest level, the two items i_x and $i_{\bar{x}}$ corresponding to each variable $x \in X_l$ have weights and profits $w_{i_x}, p_{i_x}, w_{i_{\bar{x}}}$ and $p_{i_{\bar{x}}}$ with digit 1 in the position labelled by the variable x and 0 in the positions labelled by other variables.

If literal x appears in clause $c \in C$, then p_{i_x} and w_{i_x} have digit 1 in the position labelled as c , and 0 otherwise. Similarly, if literal $\neg x$ appears in clause $c \in C$, $p_{i_{\bar{x}}}$ and $w_{i_{\bar{x}}}$ have digit 1 in the position labelled by c , and 0 otherwise.

Finally, if $l \geq 3, \forall x \in X_l$, p_{i_x} and $p_{i_{\bar{x}}}$ have value $\delta_l = \prod_{l'=2}^{l-1} (|X_{l'}|+1)$ encoded in base 10 in the positions from M on.

- For each interdiction level l (with l an even number), the two items i_x and $i_{\bar{x}}$ corresponding to $x \in X_l$ have weights and profits with digit 1 in the higher position labelled by variable x and 0 in the lower position labelled by x and in the positions labelled by other variables.

The profits p_{i_x} and $p_{i_{\bar{x}}}$ have, $\forall x \in X_l$, in the positions from M on, value $\delta_l = \prod_{l'=2}^{l-1} (|X_{l'}|+1)$ if $l \geq 4$, and value $\delta_2 = 1$ if $l = 2$. If literal x appears in clause $c \in C$, then the profit and weight have digit 1 in the position labelled as c , and 0 otherwise. Similarly, if literal $\neg x$ appears in clause $c \in C$, the profit and weight have digit 1 in the position labelled by c , and 0 otherwise.

The item j_x corresponding to x has a weight w_{j_x} and profit p_{j_x} with digit 2 in the higher position labelled as x and 0 elsewhere.

Finally, the item j'_x corresponding to x has a weight $w_{j'_x}$ with digit 1 in the higher position labelled as x and 0 elsewhere and a profit $p_{j'_x}$ with digit 1 in the lower position labelled as x and 0 elsewhere.

- For each $c \in C$, the first item i_c^1 has weight and profit with digit 1 in the position labelled as c and 0 elsewhere, and the second item i_c^2 has weight and profit with digit 2 in the position labelled as c and 0 elsewhere.
- The attack budget for even levels is $B_l = |X_l|$, while the fortification budget for odd levels $l \geq 3$ is $B_l = |X_l| + |X_{l+1}|$ if l is not the highest decision level and $B_l = |X_l|$ otherwise.
- The capacity W has 1s for all digits with labels associated to either the fortification levels or the lowest level, 2s for all digits corresponding to the higher position associated with labels in interdiction levels, 0s in the lower position associated with each label in interdiction levels and 4s for all digits with labels in C , and 0 for digit M .
- The profit goal \bar{K} has digit 1 in all positions with labels in U and 4 in all positions with labels in C , and value $\sum_{l=2}^{m+1} \delta_l |X_l|$ in the positions starting at M .

The reduction is still polynomial because the profit goal \bar{K} has $|C| + \sum_{k=1}^{m+1} \left(1 + \frac{1+(-1)^k}{2}\right) |X_k| + \lceil \log_{10}(\sum_{l=2}^{m+1} \delta_l |X_l|) \rceil$ digits and all other numbers are smaller. The proof of completeness is based mainly on the following properties:

- The defender must select exactly one item for each pair associated with a variable at each level I_{X_l} for $l = 1, \dots, m+1$, plus all the j'_x items defined in the interdiction levels; this is allowed by the capacity and the fortification budgets.
- At any fortification level l (l odd), the defender fortifies the uninterdicted items corresponding to the above decision level of the 3-SAT problem, as well as one item for each pair of I_{X_l} , due to the hierarchical nature of the profits. The structure of the weights at the lowest level compels to fortify only one item between i_x and $i_{\bar{x}}$ for a given $x \in X_l$, as the defender cannot select both such items together.
- At any interdiction level l (l even), the attacker interdicts one item for each pair of I_{X_l} , due to the hierarchical nature of the profits. If the attacker does not interdict one and only one item between i_x and $i_{\bar{x}}$, some item $j_{x'}$ at some decision level can be selected by the defender in the last round of decision, which automatically allows the defender to reach \bar{K} .
- The fact that the defender can or cannot reach a value of 4 for each digit labelled in C of both profit and weight of the lowest level is equivalent to fulfilling or not the 3-SAT formula.

Since the logic of the proof is very similar to the ones of the completeness of UBIK and UTIK developed above, we omit further details. We only observe that reasonings similar to the previous proofs will lead the defender to saturate the capacity at each digit, leaving no residual capacity to select items that correspond to lower decision levels of the SAT instance. \square

Appendix B The Tri-level Electric Power Grid Fortification Problem

The last problem we will tackle is a power grid fortification-interdiction problem. The interdiction of electric power grids is a well studied interdiction problem [12, 30, 31], and the same holds for its fortification version [9, 16, 38].

Problem definition The problem requires to decide the amount of power generated and routed through a distribution network in order to feed a set of demand points. In its interdiction version, the attacker disables elements of the power network, subjected to an attack budget, to prevent the defender from covering the whole demand. The protection version adds a further top decision layer in which the defender fortifies some of the network elements, making them

impossible to disable. We will limit ourselves to the case where the attacks concentrate on the elements that are easier to physically access, i.e., the transmission lines.

The model of the power grid considers a set J of generators, a set L of transmission lines and a set N of buses, formally defined as the set of start and end points of the transmission lines. Each generator or demand point is attached to a specific bus. The system can be seen as a graph where each node n models a bus, each arc models the transmission line l between an origin bus O_l and a destination bus D_l . The subset of generators $J_n \subseteq J$ connected to bus $n \in N$ acts as a source of power flow. The flow is absorbed by the buses through some level of power demand. After the attacker has disabled some transmission lines, the physical characteristics of the generators are such that the power fed to the network can only be decreased or increased by a limited amount (called respectively *ramping-down* or *ramping-up* of the generator). The problem is therefore somewhat similar to a fortification problem based on a network flow, but with multiple sources and sinks and a more constrained behaviour of the base network flow problem coming from the physics of electric power generation and transmission. The power grid optimization model requires the following parameters:

- $P_{j,0}^g$: power output of generator $j \in J$ before any attack;
- RD_j and RU_j : ramping-down and ramping-up of generator $j \in J$;
- \bar{P}_j^g : maximum capacity of generator $j \in J$;
- P_n^d : total load at bus $n \in N$ (power demand);
- \bar{P}_l^f : load flow capacity of line $l \in L$;
- X_l : reactance of line $l \in L$;
- k_l and z_l : respectively, fortification and attack weight of line $l \in L$;
- K : fortification budget;
- Z : attack budget.

The model uses the following decision variables:

- d_l : binary variable equal to 1 if line $l \in L$ is fortified, 0 otherwise;
- a_l : binary variable equal to 1 if line $l \in L$ is attacked, 0 otherwise;
- p_l^f : power flow through transmission line $l \in L$;
- p_j^g : power output of generator $j \in J$;
- Δp_n^d : uncovered power demand at bus $n \in N$;
- δ_n : voltage phase angle (in radians) at bus $n \in N$.

A multi-level mathematical program to represent the optimisation problem can be written as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{d \in \{0,1\}^{|L|}} \quad & \max_{a \in \{0,1\}^{|L|}} \quad \min_{p, \Delta p, \delta} \sum_{n \in N} \Delta p_n^d \\ \sum_{l \in L} k_l d_l \leq K \quad & \sum_{l \in L} z_l a_l \leq Z \\ & a_l \leq 1 - d_l, \forall l \in L \end{aligned} \tag{2a}$$

$$s.t. \quad p_l^f = (1 - a_l) \frac{1}{X_l} (\delta_{O_l} - \delta_{D_l}), \quad \forall l \in L \tag{2b}$$

$$\sum_{j \in J_n} p_j^g - \sum_{l: O_l = n} p_l^f + \sum_{l: D_l = n} p_l^f + \Delta p_n^d = P_n^d, \quad \forall n \in N \tag{2c}$$

$$0 \leq \Delta p_n^d \leq \bar{P}_n^d, \quad \forall n \in N \tag{2d}$$

$$0 \leq p_j^g \leq \bar{P}_j^g, \quad \forall j \in J \tag{2e}$$

$$P_{j,0}^g - RD_j \leq p_j^g \leq P_{j,0}^g + RU_j, \quad j \in J \tag{2f}$$

$$-\bar{P}_l^f \leq p_l^f \leq \bar{P}_l^f, \quad \forall l \in L \tag{2g}$$

$$d_l \in \{0, 1\}, a_l \in \{0, 1\}, \quad \forall l \in L. \tag{2h}$$

The objective of the defender (2a) is to minimise the sum of the uncovered power demands Δp_n^d over all buses, while the attacker tries to maximise it. Both the fortification and the attack efforts are limited by their respective budgets, and attacks are restricted to non-fortified lines (see the constraints below the first min and the max). The power flowing through a transmission line is 0 in case of a line attack (constraints (2b)); otherwise, it is approximately proportional to the inverse of the line reactance and to the difference of the voltage angles at the origin and destination node. This estimate is based on considering the resistance of the transmission line as negligible and stopping the Taylor expansion of the sine of the phase difference between buses at the first order ($\sin \alpha \simeq \alpha$ if $\alpha \ll 1$). Both simplifications are generally justified when studying electric power grid interdiction (see, e.g., [30, 38]).

After the attack on the lines, the demand at each bus is not necessarily covered: the classical flow conservation constraints at nodes (constraints (2c)) account for a quantity Δp_n^d of uncovered power at each bus $n \in N$. This cannot exceed the total demand of the bus (constraints (2d)). However, the power delivered by the generators can be adjusted only in a certain range around its former value (constraints (2f)). The power flowing through a transmission line is also bounded by the line capacity (constraints (2g)).

While in classic network flow problems the demand at the sink nodes must be fully satisfied, here we try to minimise the uncovered demand.

Σ_2^p -completeness of the TEPGF problem We now proceed to demonstrate the completeness of the TEPGF with unit fortification weights in the second level of the polynomial hierarchy.

TRI-LEVEL ELECTRIC POWER GRID FORTIFICATION WITH UNIT FORTIFICATION WEIGHTS (TEPGFU):

INSTANCE: A set of generators J , of buses N , of transmission lines L , with a capacity and ramping-up and down parameters associated with each generator, a capacity, a reactance, an attack weight, an origin and a destination bus for each line, two positive integer budgets K and Z for the attack and the fortification and a positive power loss goal \bar{K}' .

QUESTION: Is there a subset $F \subseteq L$ of lines to fortify, with $|F| \leq K$, such that for every subset of lines $A \subseteq L \setminus F$, with $\sum_{l \in A} z_l \leq Z$, the total uncovered power demand after the lines in A are disabled is less than or equal to \bar{K}' ?

In order to prove the Σ_2^p -completeness of the above problem, we will use UBIK, proved to be Σ_2^p -complete in Section 2.

Theorem B.1. *TEPGFU is Σ_2^p -complete.*

Proof. Proof The statement of TEPGFU is of the form $\exists F \forall A Q(F, A)$ where Q can be tested in polyomial time since the optimal power flow problem is a linear program and therefore in P, directly implying that TEPGFU is in Σ_2^p .

We propose the following reduction from UBIK (see the obtained power grid in Figure 7):

- We introduce a bus b_i for each item $i \in I$ and an additional bus g ; a transmission line l_i goes from g to b_i .
- Bus g is connected to a generator j_g with a base power output $P_{j_g,0}^g = \sum_{i \in I} p_i$, maximum capacity $\bar{P}_{j_g}^g = \sum_{i \in I} p_i$, ramping-up and down $RU_{j_g} = 0$ and $RD_{j_g} = \bar{P}_{j_g}^g$. This implies that the generator can decrease the power flow by any amount, but not increase it.
- The power demand of each bus b_i is $P_{b_i}^d = p_i$, and the load capacity of the corresponding transmission line l_i is $\bar{P}_{l_i}^f = p_i$. The attack weight is $z_{l_i} = w_i$, while the reactance of all lines is set at a constant X' such that its inverse is much larger than any line capacity (for example, $X' \gg 1/\sum_i p_i$).
- We set the fortification budget $K = B_2$, the attack budget $Z = W$ and the total uncovered demand goal $\bar{K}' = \bar{K} - 1$.

Notice that, as in SPIPUF, the defender and the attacker in TEPGFU play reversed roles with respect to UBIK: fortifying lines in TEPGFU corresponds to interdicting items in UBIK, and attacking lines in SPIPUF to selecting items in UBIK.

Suppose that UBIK is a *Yes* instance. For each item $i \in I$ interdicted in UBIK, we fortify the corresponding line l_i in TEPGFU. Therefore, the attacker in TEPGFU can only disable the remaining lines. By construction, as in UBIK where no selection of uninterdicted items can reach the profit goal \bar{K} respecting the capacity, in TEPGFU no subset of lines with total attack weight respecting the budget $W = Z$ can isolate from generator j_g (i.e., disconnect from




Figure 7: Illustration of the reduction from UBIK to TEPGFU.

j_g) a total power demand of \bar{K} . Hence, the total uncovered demand is at most $\bar{K} - 1 = \bar{K}'$. The defender can achieve this result sending a power load $p_{l_i}^f = p_i$ on each uninterdicted line, and setting the value of the voltage phase angle at the corresponding bus b_i to $\delta_{b_i} = \delta_g - X'p_i$ and δ_g to an arbitrary reference value. Since there is a single generator overall and a single transmission line for each bus, from g to b_i , equation (2c) applied to bus b_i reduces to $0 - \sum_{l:O_l=b_i} p_l^f + \sum_{l:D_l=b_i} p_l^f + \Delta p_{b_i}^d = P_{b_i}^d$, that is $p_{l_i}^f + \Delta p_{b_i}^d = P_{b_i}^d$. For the buses whose line is interdicted, this further reduces to: $\Delta p_{b_i}^d = P_{b_i}^d = p_i$, and the whole power demand is uncovered. For the remaining buses, it becomes: $p_{l_i}^f + \Delta p_{b_i}^d = (\delta_g - \delta_{b_i})/X' + \Delta p_{b_i}^d = p_i + \Delta p_{b_i}^d = p_i$, therefore $\Delta p_{b_i}^d = 0$, meaning that we can cover the whole demand of bus b_i . The total power ramping down of the generator is at most $\bar{K}' \leq RD_{j_g}$. TEPGFU is therefore a *Yes* instance.

Conversely, suppose that TEPGFU is a *Yes* instance. For each fortified line in TEPGFU, we interdict the corresponding item in UBIK. For any attack in TEPGFU which preserves the set of fortified lines, the maximum total uncovered power demand is $\bar{K}' = \bar{K} - 1$, meaning that for any set of lines with total attack weight less than or equal to $Z = W$, the corresponding total demand of the associated buses is strictly less than \bar{K} (with voltage phase angle values similar to the ones provided in the first part of the proof). We can map any follower's solution in UBIK to an attacker's solution in TEPGFU by attacking all transmission lines associated to items which are selected by the follower. Therefore, in UBIK, the follower can never select a set of items respecting the capacity W with a total profit reaching \bar{K} . UBIK is therefore a *Yes* instance, which completes the proof. \square

We observe that, as for the SPIPF, the literature on this problem usually tackles, for the sake of simplicity, the case with both unit fortification and attack weights [9, 16, 38], though approaches with general attack weights, like [30], exist. Our reduction from UBIK, however, requires non-unitary attack weights to prove Σ_2^p -completeness.