# Defense Against Shortest Path Attacks<sup>\*</sup>

Benjamin A. Miller<sup>†1</sup>, Zohair Shafi<sup>1</sup>, Wheeler Ruml<sup>2</sup>, Yevgeniy Vorobeychik<sup>3</sup>, Tina Eliassi-Rad<sup>1</sup>, and Scott Alfeld<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Northeastern University, Boston MA <sup>2</sup>University of New Hampshire, Durham NH <sup>3</sup>Washington University in St. Louis, St. Louis MO <sup>4</sup>Amherst College, Amherst MA

#### Abstract

Identifying shortest paths between nodes in a network is an important task in applications involving routing of resources. Recent work has shown that a malicious actor can manipulate a graph to make traffic between two nodes of interest follow their target path. In this paper, we develop a defense against such attacks by modifying the weights of the graph that users observe. The defender must balance inhibiting the attacker against any negative effects of the defense on benign users. Specifically, the defender's goals are: (a) to recommend the shortest paths possible to users, (b) for the lengths of the shortest paths in the published graph to be close to those of the same paths in the true graph, and (c) to minimize the probability of an attack. We formulate the defense as a Stackelberg game in which the defender is the leader and the attacker is the follower. In this context, we also consider a zero-sum version of the game, in which the defender's goal is to minimize cost while achieving the minimum possible attack probability. We show that this problem is NP-hard and propose heuristic solutions based on increasing edge weights along target paths in both the zero-sum and non-zero-sum settings. Relaxing some constraints of the original problem, we formulate a linear program for local optimization around a feasible point. We present defense results with both synthetic and real network datasets and show that these methods often reach the lower bound of the defender's cost.

<sup>\*</sup>This material is based upon work supported by the United States Air Force under Air Force Contract No. FA8702-15-D-0001 and the Combat Capabilities Development Command Army Research Laboratory (under Cooperative Agreement Number W911NF-13-2-0045). Any opinions, findings, conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Air Force or Army Research Laboratory.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>†</sup>Contact author: miller.be@northeastern.edu

### 1 Introduction

In numerous applications involving the routing of resources through a network, finding the shortest path between two nodes is an important problem. A malicious actor with the capacity to modify the graph could entice users to follow a particular path that could put them at risk. To counter adversarial activity, it is important to consider defensive measures against such behavior.

Recent work has proposed an algorithm to manipulate the shortest path when the attacker is able to remove edges. In this paper, taking inspiration from differential privacy, we propose a defensive technique based on perturbing edge weights. Users are presented an altered set of edge weights that aims to provide the shortest paths possible while making the attacker's target more expensive. The contributions of this paper are as follows: (1) We define a defender cost based on the impact on user experience and probability of attack. (2) We formulate a Stackelberg game to optimize the defender's expected cost. (3) In a zero-sum setting, we show that this optimization is NP-hard. (4) We propose a heuristic algorithm called PATHDEFENSE that greedily increments edge weights until the user's cost is sufficiently low. (5) We present results on simulated and real networks demonstrating the cost improvement PATHDEFENSE provides.

## 2 Method

In our problem setting, a graph G has weights w, and an attacker intends to remove edges to make a particular target path be the shortest between its endpoints. The defender's goal is to publish an approximate set of weights that provide users with short paths to their destinations while also increasing the burden on the adversary, making an attack less likely. This method is inspired by a differential privacy technique for approximating shortest paths without revealing true weights [22], though here we consider the weight perturbations in an optimization context. We refer to the problem of minimizing the defender's cost in this context as the *Cut Defense* problem. The analysis over the remainder of the paper makes the following assumptions: (1) The attacker has a single target path  $p^*$  and uses PATHATTACK to optimize the attack. (2) If PATHATTACK identifies an attack within the attacker's budget, the attack will occur. (3) True edge weights and removal costs are known to the attacker.

#### 2.1 Notation

We consider a graph G = (V, E), which may be directed or undirected. Each edge has a nonnegative weight  $w : E \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ . These are the weights denoting the true traversal distance. The defender publishes weights  $w' : E \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ , which may be different than w. For a given source–destination pair  $s, t \in V$ , let  $p(G, \hat{w}, s, t)$  be the shortest path in G from s to t using weights  $\hat{w}$ . For a given path p between two nodes, let  $\ell(G, \hat{w}, p)$  be the length of p in G using weights  $\hat{w}$ . We denote by  $p^*$  and b the attacker's target path and budget, respectively. When determining the impact on users, we consider the distribution of source–destination pairs,  $\mathcal{D}$ , as this will help determine how often paths are disrupted. In addition, we assume the defender has uncertainty about  $p^*$  and b. The defender considers a distribution  $\mathcal{P}$  of possible target paths and a distribution  $\mathcal{B}$  of possible budgets. These distributions result in a distribution of user-observed graphs,  $\mathcal{G}$ , which we describe in the next section. The defender's cost (loss) function is denoted by L. A notation table is provided in Appendix A.

#### 2.2 Stackelberg Game

We frame our method as a Stackelberg game, in which the defender is the leader and the attacker is the follower. The defender has full knowledge of the attacker's action set, and chooses the optimal solution given the attacker's assumed response. Here, we briefly describe the two players in the game.

Attacker The attacker will observe a graph G = (V, E) with weights w' published by the defender, and may also know the true weights w. Each edge  $e \in E$  has a cost of removal c(e) > 0 that is known to the attacker. The attacker has a target path  $p^*$ , which goes from a source node s to a destination node t, and a budget b specifying the greatest cost of edge removal that the attacker can expend. The attacker runs the version of PATHATTACK called PATHATTACK-LP in [21]. This algorithm iteratively solves a relaxed version of the integer program

$$\hat{\Delta} = \underset{\Delta}{\arg\min} \mathbf{c}^{\top} \mathbf{x} \tag{1}$$

s.t. 
$$\Delta \in \{0,1\}^{|E|} \tag{2}$$

$$\mathbf{x}_p^\top \Delta \ge 1, \forall p \in P_{p^*} \tag{3}$$

$$\mathbf{x}_{p^*}^{\top} \Delta = 0. \tag{4}$$

Here,  $\Delta$  is an indicator vector for edges to remove from the graph,  $P_{p^*}$  is the set of paths that compete with  $p^*$  to be the shortest (i.e., all paths from s to t that are not longer than  $p^*$ , using the published weights w'),  $\mathbf{x}_p$  is an indicator vector for the edges in path p, and  $\mathbf{c}$  is the vector of edge removal costs. The algorithm uses constraint generation to identify a subset of paths to use for constraint (3) and performs a randomized rounding procedure to get an integer solution to the relaxed problem. The algorithm outputs a set of edges E', indicated by  $\hat{\Delta}$ , whose size is is within a logarithmic factor of the smallest possible solution. If  $c(E') = \sum_{e \in E'} c(e) \leq b$ , then the attacker executes the attack, and the graph used by all parties becomes  $G' = (V, E \setminus E')$ . If c(E') > b, the attack is not worth the cost to the attacker, so G' = G.

**Defender** In addition to the true nodes and edges of the graph G = (V, E), the defender has knowledge of the true weights  $w : E \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  that will be experienced by users traversing the graph. The defender will publish a different set

of weights w'. While the defender knows that the attacker will use PATHATTACK, we assume there is uncertainty with respect to the attacker's target path  $p^*$  and budget b. The defender has a distribution over both of these variables, as defined above. The distributions  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  combine with the published weights w'to create a distribution over graphs  $\mathcal{G}$  as follows. For a given  $p^*$  in  $\mathcal{P}$ , let E' be the solution given by PATHATTACK using the published weights, and is a unique solution across all target paths. (If multiple target paths have the same solution, the probability of the resulting graph integrates across the paths.) Then the probability that users observe graph  $G' = (V, E \setminus E')$  is

$$\Pr_{\mathcal{G}}[G'] = \Pr_{P \sim \mathcal{P}}[P = p^*] \cdot \Pr_{B \sim \mathcal{B}}[|E'| \le B].$$
(5)

The defender's goal is to publish a set of weights that has minimal expected cost, i.e.,

$$\hat{w}' = \operatorname*{arg\,min}_{w'} \mathbb{E}\left[L(G, w, w', \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{B})\right].$$
(6)

There are several considerations when defining the defender's cost, which we discuss in detail next.

#### 2.3 Defender's Cost Function

The attacker's cost function is simple: After running PATHATTACK, if the cost of edge removal is within the budget, the attack is carried out. When determining the best course of action, the defender has three considerations. The first is the cost incurred by users of the network: the distance they must travel to get from their origin points to their destinations. If the users must travel longer distances, the cost to the defender is higher. Note that this is the actual distance traveled: The user selects a path p based on the perturbed weights w', but the distance is computed based the original weights w. There is also a cost associated with the user traveling a different distance than advertised. If the length of p is  $\ell^{\rm true}$ , but the user is told the length is  $\ell^{\rm obs}$ , this may negatively affect the user's experience. If  $\ell^{\rm obs} < \ell^{\rm true}$ , then the user will likely be dissatisfied with traversing a longer distance than advertised. The case where  $\ell^{\rm obs} > \ell^{\rm true}$  is less clear. If the advertised distance is only slightly greater than the true distance, the user may be happy to experience a shorter distance than advertised. If, on the other hand, the advertised distance is drastically larger, this may induce an additional burden on users. Since deviations between the true and observed weights may cause user dissatisfaction, this is an additional cost for the defender.

Finally, there may be situations where there is some additional cost to the defender if the adversary is successful. This would be a cost *in addition* to the cost due to longer distances experienced by users after the attack. If, for example, the new traffic route allows the adversary to gain a competitive advantage over the defender, this would have a broader negative consequence for the defender than the specific issue of users experiencing longer distances. If this is an issue for the defender, there will be another component to the cost function to account for the expected cost of attacker success.

To mathematically formalize the cost function, we consider the three costs described above:

- 1.  $L_d$ : The average distance traveled by users
- 2.  $L_e$ : The average cost of the *error* between advertised and true path distances
- 3.  $L_s$ : The expected cost of attacker success

Cost 1 takes the expected value across source–destination pairs  $s, t \sim \mathcal{D}$ . While the path p from u to v is determined using the observed weights w', the distance experienced by users is based on the true weights w. Thus, for a user traveling from u to v, we use the path p(G', w', u, v), which has length  $\ell(G', w, p(G', w', u, v))$ . Aggregating across all pairs, cost 1 is expressed as

$$L_d(G, w, w', \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{P}) = \mathbb{E}_{u, v \sim \mathcal{D}, G' \sim \mathcal{G}(G, w', \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{P})} \left[ \ell(G', w, p(G', w', u, v)) \right].$$
(7)

Cost 2 considers the same path as cost 1, but rather than the distance traveled, the defender considers some function of the error between the advertised and true path lengths. Let  $c_{\rm err}$  denote this function. Then cost 2 is given by

$$L_e(G, w, w', \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{P}) = \mathbb{E}_{s, t \sim \mathcal{D}, G' \sim \mathcal{G}(G, w', \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{P})} \left[ c_{\mathrm{err}}(\ell^{\mathrm{true}}, \ell^{\mathrm{obs}}) \right], \qquad (8)$$

where  $\ell^{\text{true}} = \ell(G', w, p(G', w', s, t))$  and  $\ell^{\text{obs}} = \ell(G', w', p(G', w', s, t))$ . The shape of  $c_{\text{err}}$  will vary based on the defender's belief about users' degree of dissatisfaction with errors in reported path lengths. Here we use the function

$$c_{\rm err}(\ell^{\rm true}, \ell^{\rm obs}) = \begin{cases} f_+(\ell^{\rm obs} - \ell^{\rm true}) & \text{if } \ell^{\rm obs} \ge \ell^{\rm true} \\ f_-(\ell^{\rm true} - \ell^{\rm obs}) & \text{if } \ell^{\rm obs} < \ell^{\rm true} \end{cases}, \tag{9}$$

where  $f_+, f_- > 0$  denote different marginal costs for overstating or understating, respectively, the length of the user's path.

Finally, cost 3 occurs if the attack is successful. The defender has a parameter  $\lambda \ge 0$  that denotes the cost of attacker success. The cost to the defender is

 $L_s = \lambda \Pr[p^* \text{ is the shortest observed path between its terminals in } G'].$  (10)

If the only cost of an attack is the direct disruption to users accounted for in  $L_d$  and  $L_e$ , then the defender sets  $\lambda = 0$ .

A pseudocode description for an algorithm to compute the cost is provided in Appendix B.

### 3 Optimization

We begin by formally formulating the optimization to solve Cut Defense. We then define a zero-sum version in which the defender's goal is to reduce cost given that the probability of attack is minimized. We propose a heuristic method that results in a feasible solution for a single target path, then extend its usage to multiple target paths. We finally derive a linear program for local optimization around a feasible point.

#### 3.1 Non-Convex Optimization Formulation

We optimize cost while varying perturbed weights. Let  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{|E|}$  be the vector of original edge weights, where each edge has been given an arbitrary index corresponding to its vector entry. The vector  $\mathbf{w}'$  contains the perturbed weights,  $\mathbf{c}$  contains edge removal costs, and  $\mathbf{x}_p$  is a binary indicator vector for path p, i.e., if the *i*th edge is in path p, the *i*th entry in  $\mathbf{x}_p$  is 1, otherwise it is 0. Let P(u, v) be the set of all paths from u to v and  $\operatorname{supp}(\mathcal{P})$  be all paths with nonzero probability of being the target, and  $\mathcal{X}(G, \mathbf{w}, p^*)$  be the set of attacks against graph G with weights  $\mathbf{w}$  to make  $p^*$  be the shortest path between its terminal nodes. We solve Cut Defense by optimizing as follows:

$$\hat{\mathbf{w}}' = \operatorname*{arg\,min}_{\mathbf{w}'} \lambda \left(1 - z_{\emptyset}\right) + \sum_{u,v \in V} L_d(u,v) + L_e(u,v) \tag{11}$$

s.t. 
$$L_d(u, v) = \Pr_{D \sim \mathcal{D}}[D = (u, v)] \cdot \sum_{p^* \in \operatorname{supp}(\mathcal{P}) \cup \{\emptyset\}} z_{p^*} \cdot \ell_{uv, p^*}^{\operatorname{true}} \quad \forall u, v \in V \quad (12)$$

$$L_{e}(u,v) = \Pr_{D \sim \mathcal{D}}[D = (u,v)] \cdot \left(f_{+} \cdot d_{uv,p^{*}}^{\text{pos}} + f_{-} \cdot d_{uv,p^{*}}^{\text{neg}})\right) \quad \forall u, v \in V$$
(13)

$$\Delta_{p^*} \in \mathcal{X}(G, \mathbf{w}', p^*) \quad \forall p^* \in \operatorname{supp}(\mathcal{P})$$
(14)

$$\Delta_{\{\emptyset\}} = \mathbf{0} \tag{15}$$

$$\mathbf{c}^{\mathsf{T}} \Delta_{p^*} \leq \mathbf{c}^{\mathsf{T}} \Delta \quad \forall \Delta \in \mathcal{X}(G, \mathbf{w}', p^*), p^* \in \operatorname{supp}(\mathcal{P})$$
(16)

$$z_{p^*} = \Pr(p^*) \sum_{i \ge \mathbf{c}^\top \Delta_{p^*}} \Pr_{B \sim \mathcal{B}}[B=i] \quad \forall p^* \in \operatorname{supp}(\mathcal{P})$$
(17)

$$z_{\emptyset} = 1 - \sum_{p^* \in \text{supp}(\mathcal{P})} z_{p^*} \tag{18}$$

$$z_{p^*} \ge 0 \quad \forall p^* \in \operatorname{supp}(\mathcal{P}) \cup \{\emptyset\}$$
(19)

$$p_{uv,p^*} = \underset{p \in P(u,v)}{\operatorname{arg\,min}} \mathbf{x}_p^{\top} (\mathbf{w}' + W\Delta_{p^*}) \quad \forall u, v \in V, p^* \in \operatorname{supp}(\mathcal{P}) \cup \{\emptyset\} \quad (20)$$

$$\ell_{uv,p^*}^{\text{true}} = \mathbf{x}_{p_{uv,p^*}}^{\top} \mathbf{w} \quad \forall u, v \in V, p^* \in \text{supp}(\mathcal{P}) \cup \{\emptyset\}$$
(21)

$$\ell_{uv,p^*}^{\text{obs}} = \mathbf{x}_{p_{uv,p^*}}^{\top} \mathbf{w}' \quad \forall u, v \in V, p^* \in \text{supp}(\mathcal{P}) \cup \{\emptyset\}$$
(22)

$$d_{uv,p^*}^{\text{pos}}, d_{uv,p^*}^{\text{neg}} \ge 0 \quad \forall u, v \in V, p^* \in \text{supp}(\mathcal{P}) \cup \{\emptyset\}$$
(23)

$$d_{uv,p^*}^{\text{pos}} - d_{uv,p^*}^{\text{neg}} = \ell_{uv,p^*}^{\text{obs}} - \ell_{uv,p^*}^{\text{true}} \quad \forall u, v \in V, p^* \in \text{supp}(\mathcal{P}) \cup \{\emptyset\}.$$
(24)

Note that  $p_{uv,p^*}$ , defined in (20), is the shortest path from u to v according to the published weights after the attacker attacks when the target path is  $p^*$ . The case where there is attack is considered when  $p^* = \emptyset$ . This means that  $\ell_{uv,p^*}^{\text{true}}$  and  $\ell_{uv,p^*}^{\text{obs}}$  correspond to  $\ell$  and  $\ell'$ , respectively, in (8).

One potential concern when calculating the expected cost across pairs of nodes is the possibility that the graph could become disconnected, leaving some inter-node distances infinite. The best attack, however, will never result in a disconnected graph. If the optimal solution disconnected a connected graph, there would be multiple connected components, one of which contains the target path  $p^*$ . However, if a single edge that connected the component that includes  $p^*$  to another component were added back to the graph,  $p^*$  would remain the shortest path between its terminals. This contradicts the assumption that the proposed attack was optimal, and yields the following theorem.

**Theorem 1.** The optimal  $\Delta_{p^*}$  in (16) will not disconnect the graph.

Since PATHATTACK is an approximation algorithm, there is a possibility that the resulting attack will result in a disconnected graph. Thus, we apply a slight modification to the original PATHATTACK from [21]: after the rounding procedure, if the attack results in multiple connected components, add the highest-cost edge between two connected components back to the graph until it is connected again.

#### 3.2 Zero-Sum Formulation

In the prior section, we assumed a non-zero-sum game in which the optima for the attacker and defender may coincide. We gain additional insight into the problem by considering the zero-sum version of the problem, in which the defender's primary goal is ensuring the attack does not occur. In this case, we are given the same information as in Cut Defense except the cost of attack success  $\lambda$ . Instead, the defender manipulates the weights w' to minimize the probability of attack, i.e.,

$$z_{\min} = \min_{w'} \sum_{p^* \in \mathcal{P}} \Pr_{P \sim \mathcal{P}}[P = p^*] \cdot \Pr_{B \sim \mathcal{B}}[c(E'(G, w', p^*)) \le B].$$
(25)

Within the minimized attack probability, however, the defender wants the cost to be as low as possible. Thus, the Zero-Sum Cut Defense problem is given by

$$\hat{w}' = \operatorname*{arg\,min}_{w'} L_d(G, w, w', \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{P}) + L_e(G, w, w', \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{P})$$
(26)

s.t. 
$$\sum_{p^* \in \mathcal{P}} \Pr_{P \sim \mathcal{P}}[P = p^*] \cdot \Pr_{B \sim \mathcal{B}}[c(E'(G, w', p^*)) \le B] = z_{\min}.$$
 (27)

Note that  $L_s$  is not considered in the objective in this formulation, since the attack probability is fixed at its minimum possible value. We show that this version of the problem is NP-hard.

#### Theorem 2. The Zero-Sum Cut Defense problem is NP-hard.

Proof Sketch. We prove NP hardness via reduction from the Knapsack problem. Given a set of n items with values  $\nu_i \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  and weights  $\eta_i \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , and two thresholds U and H, the Knapsack problem is to determine whether there is a subset of items with total value at least U with weight no more than H. For each item, we create a triangle in a graph, where consecutive triangles share a node as shown in Fig. 1. The *i*th triangle consists of the nodes  $u_{i-1}$ ,  $u_i$ , and  $\omega_i$ . Let  $s = u_0$  and  $t = u_n$ . We create a Zero-Sum Cut Defense instance in which the support of  $\mathcal{P}$  consists of the single path from s to t that passes through no



Figure 1: Reduction from Knapsack to Zero-Sum Cut Defense. The *i*th item in the set corresponds to a triangle  $\{u_{i-1}, \omega_i, u_i\}$ . All target paths go from  $s = u_0$  to  $t = u_n$ . The target path  $p^*$  traverses the bottom edges on the figure, highlighted in red. Keeping defender cost low while ensuring the probability of attack is 0 is equivalent to keeping the weight of the knapsack low while ensuring the value is sufficient.

nodes  $\omega_i$  for any  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . For all i, edge  $\{u_{i-1}, u_i\}$  has weight 1 and removal cost 1,  $\{u_{i-1}, \omega_i\}$  has weight 1 and cost  $v_i$ , and edge  $\{\omega_i, u_i\}$  has weight  $w_i$  and cost  $v_i$ . The adversary's budget is U-1 with probability 1. The defender's cost only considers traffic going from s to t, i.e.,  $\Pr_{(x,y)\sim\mathcal{D}}[(x,y)=(s,t)]=1$ . Let  $f_+=1$  and  $f_-=H'=\sum_{i=1}^n w_i$ .

Since the adversary's budget is U - 1, in order to minimize the attack probability (in this case, make it 0), the defender must force some subset of edges along  $p^*$  to have length at least the same as the two-hop paths running parallel to them. The removal costs on the parallel paths of these edges must sum to at least V: the defender's "value" is increased cost for the attacker. The increase in distance traveled for the user will be commensurate with the weights of the items associated with the perturbed edges. This provides a direct mapping between solving Knapsack and solving Zero-Sum Cut Defense on the generated graph. A detailed proof is provided in Appendix C.

While the problem cannot be efficiently solved in general, we find feasible points fairly easily by increasing the length of  $p^*$  until the cost of edges used in **PATHATTACK** is sufficiently high. Starting with weights w' initialized to the true weights w, the procedure is as follows.

- 1.  $E' \leftarrow \text{PATHATTACK}(G, w', p^*)$
- 2.  $p \leftarrow 2$ nd shortest path between the terminals of  $p^*$ , if it exists
- 3. pick an edge e from  $E_{p^*} \setminus E_p$
- 4. increase w'(e) by  $\delta = \ell(G, w', p) \ell(G, w', p^*)$

Here  $E_p$  is the set of edges on path p. This procedure continues until either  $p^*$  is the longest path between its terminals or c(E') exceeds the largest possible attack budget. This procedure yields a feasible point, assuming PATHATTACK provides an optimal solution. If we continue until  $p^*$  is the longest path, we are definitely at a feasible point: all other paths that connect  $p^*$ 's endpoints need to be cut. This observation yields the following theorem.

**Theorem 3.** When  $\mathcal{P}$  consists of a single path  $p^*$ , performing the procedure above yields a feasible point for Zero-Sum Cut Defense.

While having multiple possible target paths complicates the problem, we use a similar principle to reduce the probability of attack. For each target path, we increase the edge weights as described above. We then apply PATHATTACK and use the number of edges removed to calculate the attack probability. Then, starting from the original graph, we consider the target paths in order of increasing attack probability. We then increase the edge weights on each target path again, accumulating the new weights each time. This prioritizes the path at the end of the sequence, which has the highest probability of resulting in an attack.

#### 3.3 Heuristic Method

From the zero-sum case, we see that increasing the weights on target paths is an effective strategy. Taking this as inspiration, we propose a heuristic algorithm that iteratively chooses an edge e from some target path  $p^*$  and increments its weight to add another path to  $P_{p^*}$ . We call this algorithm PATHDEFENSE. At each iteration, the algorithm considers edges on which the smallest possible weight increase will provide one target path with a new competing path. For a given target path  $p^*$ , these edges are identified by applying PATHATTACK and finding the second-shortest path p between the source and destination of  $p^*$ , if such a path exists. The edges in  $p^*$  that are not part of p may be incremented to add p as a competing path that must be cut to make  $p^*$  shortest. Pseudocode for this subroutine is provided in Algorithm 1. The attack probability is evaluated after considering each possible perturbation, and whichever perturbation results in the smallest attack probability is kept. If multiple perturbations result in the same attack probability, the edge is chosen that maximizes the average length of  $p^*$ . This procedure continues until (1) all target paths are the longest between their terminals, (2) a threshold is reached in terms of cost, attack probability, or number of iterations. Pseudocode for PATHDEFENSE is provided in Algorithm 2.

#### 3.4 Relaxation: Local Optimization Around a Feasible Point

Once a feasible point is identified, we relax the hardest constraints to formulate a linear program for local optimization. In this case, we fix the attack that occurs for each  $p^*$ , and ensure that the observed shortest path between each pair of nodes remains the same as the weights are varied. By fixing the attack, we are given a value for  $\Delta_{p^*}$  and  $z_{p^*}$ , thus removing constraints (14)–(19) from the nonconvex optimization in Section 3.1. By fixing the shortest path, we are given a value for  $p_{uv,p^*}$ , replacing constraint (20) with

$$\ell_{uv,p^*}^{\text{obs}} \leq \mathbf{x}_p^{\top} \left( \mathbf{w}' + W\Delta_{p^*} \right) \quad \forall u, v \in V, p^* \in \text{supp}(\mathcal{P}) \cup \{ \emptyset \}, p \in P(u, v)$$
(28)

Algorithm 1 get\_edge\_increments

**Input**: graph G = (V, E), perturbed weights w',  $p^*$  dist.  $\mathcal{P}$ **Output**: set of edges and increment values R1:  $R \leftarrow \emptyset$ 2: for all  $p^* \in \text{supp}(\mathcal{P})$  do  $E_{\text{temp}} \leftarrow \text{PATHATTACK}(G, w', p^*)$ 3:  $G' \leftarrow (V, E \setminus E_{\text{temp}})$ 4: if  $p^*$  is not the only path from s to t in G' then 5:  $p \leftarrow 2$ nd shortest path from s to t in G' using w' 6: 7: $\delta \leftarrow \ell(G', w', p) - \ell(G', w', p^*)$ for all  $e \in E_p \setminus E_{p^*}$  do 8:  $R \leftarrow R \cup \{(e, \delta)\}$ 9. end for 10: end if 11: 12: end for 13: return R

All remaining constraints in the nonconvex program are linear. This is not, however, sufficient to locally optimize: The attack  $\Delta_{p^*}$  must be both necessary (not cut superfluous edges) and sufficient (cut all paths that compete with  $p^*$ ). To optimize within this context, we add the constraints

$$\mathbf{x}_{p^*}^\top \mathbf{w}' \le \mathbf{x}_p^\top (\mathbf{w}' + W\Delta_{p^*}) - \epsilon_{p^*} \quad \forall p^* \in \operatorname{supp}(\mathcal{P}), p \in P(s_{p^*}, t_{p^*})$$
(29)

$$\mathbf{x}_{p^*}^{\top} \mathbf{w}' \ge \mathbf{x}_p^{\top} \mathbf{w}' \quad p^* \in \operatorname{supp}(\mathcal{P}), p \in P_{p^*}$$
(30)

Here  $s_{p^*}$  and  $t_{p^*}$  are the source and destination nodes, respectively, of  $p^*$  and  $P_{p^*}$ is the set of paths competing with  $p^*$  that were used by PATHATTACK to obtain  $\Delta_{p^*}$ . To ensure sufficiency, (29) constrains all paths between the terminals of a target path  $p^*$  to be strictly longer than  $p^*$ . The additional variables  $\epsilon_p^*$  may be measured based on the difference in lengths between  $p^*$  and the second-shortest path after the attack. Constraint (30) ensures necessity by making all paths that competed with  $p^*$  at the feasible point to remain competitive. Since all constraints are linear, we use constraint generation to explicitly state a subset of the necessary constraints, just as in the PATHATTACK algorithm.

### 4 Experiments

We demonstrate the optimization procedure using 4 synthetic network generators and 4 real networks. All synthetic networks have 250 nodes and an average degree of approximately 12. We use Erdős–Rényi (ER) random graphs, Barabási–Albert (BA) preferential attachment graphs, Watts–Strogatz (WS) small-world graphs, and stochastic blockmodel (SBM) graphs where nodes are separated into communities of size 200 and 50. All edges are given weights drawn from a Poisson distribution with rate parameter 20 and removal costs are set to 1.

Algorithm 2 PATHDEFENSE Heuristic Defense Algorithm

**Input**: graph G = (V, E), true weights w, budget dist.  $\mathcal{B}$ ,  $p^*$  dist.  $\mathcal{P}$ , (s, t) pair dist.  $\mathcal{D}$ , attack cost  $\lambda$ , cost threshold  $\epsilon_c$ , attack prob. threshold  $\epsilon_a$ , max. iterations  $i_{\max}$ 

**Output**: perturbed weights w'

1:  $w' \leftarrow w$ 2: repeat  $R \leftarrow \texttt{get\_edge\_increments}(G, w', \mathcal{P})$ 3:  $(e_{\min}, \delta_{\min}, z_{\min}, \ell_{\min}) \leftarrow (\emptyset, 0, 2, 0)$ 4: 5: for all  $(e, \delta) \in R$  do  $w'(e) \leftarrow w'(e) + \delta$ 6:  $z \leftarrow 0$ 7: for all  $p^* \in \operatorname{supp}(\mathcal{P})$  do 8:  $E_{\text{temp}} \leftarrow \text{PATHATTACK}(G, w', p^*)$ 9:  $z \leftarrow z + \Pr_{P \sim \mathcal{P}}[P = p^*] \cdot \Pr_{B \sim \mathcal{B}}[B \ge |E_{\text{temp}}|]$ 10:if  $z < z_{\min}$  or  $(z = z_{\min} \text{ and } \mathbb{E}_{P \sim \mathcal{P}} [\ell(G, w', P)] > \ell_{\min})$  then 11:  $(e_{\min}, \delta_{\min}, z_{\min}, \ell_{\min}) \leftarrow (e, \delta, z, \mathbb{E}_{P \sim \mathcal{P}} \left[ \ell(G, w', P) \right])$ 12:end if 13:end for 14: $w'(e) \leftarrow w'(e) - \delta$ 15:end for 16: $w'(e_{\min}) \leftarrow w'(e_{\min}) + \delta_{\min}$ 17: $L_d, L_e, L_s \leftarrow \operatorname{cost}(G, w, w', \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{D}, \lambda)$ 18: $i \leftarrow i + 1$ 19:20: until  $L_d + L_e + L_s < \epsilon_c$  or  $z_{\min} < \epsilon_a$  or |R| = 0 or  $i \ge i_{\max}$ 21: return w'

The real network datasets include two transportation networks, a social network, and a computer network. The transportation networks are United States airports (USAIR), where edge weights are the number of seats on flights between airports [9], and United Kingdom metro stops (UKMET), where weights are travel times between stops in minutes [13]. The social network used is interactions between users at the 2009 ACM Hypertext Conference (HT), where weights are the number of face-to-face interactions between users over the course of the conference [15]. The computer network is an autonomous system (AS) graph [18], with weights from a Poisson distribution as in the synthetic networks.

Weights in the USAIR and HT graphs are inverted to create distances rather than similarities. More detailed statistics of the datasets and links to their web locations are provided in Appendix D.

#### 4.1 Experimental Setup

For each experiment, we choose one dataset and 1, 2, 4, or 8 target paths, ranging from 5th shortest to 19th shortest. Source–destination pairs are chosen uniformly at random and the target paths include the 5th shortest and every

second path thereafter. In some cases, all target paths have the same terminal nodes, in others, we choose independently for each path. For SBM and AS graphs, we also consider the case where the two terminal nodes are from one community of nodes, but the target path traverses nodes in another one. (We call this an *extra-community* path.) This emulates a scenario where an outside attacker wants the traffic to take a relatively unnatural path, e.g., computer traffic unnecessarily crossing national boundaries.

In each experiment,  $\mathcal{B}$  is a Poisson distribution whose rate parameter is set to the average number of edges removed by PATHATTACK across all target paths. The distribution of sources and destinations for users emphasizes the portions of the graph with target paths: with probability 0.5, we draw two nodes both either on a target path or on the true shortest path between its endpoints, and with probability 0.5 we do not. (Pairs are uniformly distributed within each category.) For each setting, results are aggregated across 10 trials.

Experiments were run on a CentOS Linux cluster with 32 cores per machine, and each job was allocated 10 GB of memory. We used Gurobi 9.5.1 for optimization and NetworkX 2.4 for graph analysis, both within Python 3.8.1.<sup>1</sup>

#### 4.2 Results

We first consider how the three components of the defender's cost vary over the course of running PATHDEFENSE. Representative results are shown in Fig. 2. In the early iterations, cost is dominated by the true distance traveled by users. Although the distribution is skewed toward the portion of the graph affected by the attack, the impact of errors is negligible in comparison. One reason for this phenomenon is that increasing edge weights discourages their use: when a path looks longer, fewer users will take it and it will not be considered in the cost. In the UKMET case, however, this changes after about 100 iterations, at which point the cost from errors drastically increases. The metro graph is somewhat tree-like, making it difficult to avoid traversing perturbed edges. In all cases, the overall reduction in cost comes from a large reduction in the probability of attack counterbalancing a small increase in the average distance traveled.

The cost of PATHDEFENSE for three additional datasets is shown in Fig. 3. The plots include cases where the rate parameter of the budget distribution is doubled and where the cost of adversary success is reduced by a factor of five. We report all costs as a proportion of a lower bound, i.e., the cost when there is no attack and no perturbation. When the adversary's budget is doubled, the initial defender cost is much larger, but the cost eventually obtained by PATHDEFENSE is very similar. It is typical for PATHDEFENSE to outperform the zero-sum case at an early iteration when there are few target paths, though this does not always happen. When there are 8 target paths in the HT graph, the zero-sum procedure produces a better result than PATHDEFENSE. This may be due to the clustering that exists in the social network: it may promote oscillation

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Gurobi: https://www.gurobi.com. NetworkX: https://networkx.org. Code for PATHATTACK is available at https://github.com/bamille1/PATHATTACK.



Figure 2: Defender cost broken down by component. Results are shown for BA (left), WS (center), and UKMET (right) graphs. Lower cost is better for the defender. In all cases there are 4 target paths with the same terminal nodes. There is a substantial reduction in cost due to the probability of adversary success being reduced, and the cost due to errors in published distances is minimal for BA and WS, whereas  $L_e$  increases a substantial amount in the UKMET data, as it is difficult to avoid traversing perturbed edges.

between competing paths, whereas the zero-sum method focuses on one path at a time. Results on all datasets are provided in Appendix E.

Results where the attacker targets a path that exits and re-enters a community are shown in Fig. 4. The lowest relative cost is higher in this case than when paths are chosen by enumerating consecutive shortest paths, which is consistent with intuition. In the SBM graph with extra-community target paths, we again see that the zero-sum method yields lower cost than PATHDEFENSE, suggesting that optimizing each target path in sequence is effective in this case as well.

### 5 Related Work

The problem of releasing a graph that can be useful while not giving away sensitive information has received considerable attention since the problem of deanonymization was discovered [4]. Much of this research has been on privacy-preserving release of social network data, where nodes are anonymized with respect to topological features like degree [19], neighborhood [25], or cluster [5].

Sharing of sensitive graph data has been studied in the context of differential privacy [11]. Sealfon [22] applied differential privacy to graph weights in the context of computing shortest paths. While keeping the true weights of the graph secret, the algorithm provides an approximate shortest path between a pair of query nodes. Other recent methods have considered differential privacy for unweighted graphs. Two methods—a data-driven low-dimensional projection [3] and random low-dimensional projections [6]—have been applied for cut queries, i.e., calculating the number of edges that must be removed to disconnect two sets of vertices. Other recent work does not necessarily preserve distances between pairs of nodes, but maintains the distribution of distances [8].

Outside of differential privacy, work has been done on reliably finding short-



Figure 3: Cost of PATHDEFENSE when all target paths share terminals. Results are shown for ER (top), USAIR (middle), and HT (bottom) graphs. the original budget and  $\lambda$  (left), when the attacker budget is doubled (center), and when the cost of attacker success is reduced by five times (right). Plots include the average cost (solid line) and the cost range across trials (shaded area), as well as the average zero-sum result (dashed line). All costs are normalized by a lower bound. As expected, increasing the adversary's budget results in slower convergence, and decreasing the attack success cost reduces the improvement provided by PATHDEFENSE.

est paths when a graph is located on an untrusted server [14]. In other work, an actor wants to "buy" a path from s to t, and the prices are only known to the current owners [2]. It has been shown in this setting that a buyer can be forced to overpay for the path [12], which is similar to the Cut Defense goal of forcing an attacker to expend extra resources, though in a different data access mechanism.

The PATHATTACK algorithm is an example of inverse optimization [1], and specifically the inverse shortest path problem [24]: rather than optimizing the path length for a given graph, we change the graph to make a certain path the shortest. Inverse shortest path problems have proven useful in various navigation scenarios [7, 17]. Other research has considered inverse shortest path lengths [23] and other inverse optimizations, such as max flow/min cut [20, 16, 10].



Figure 4: Results when the attacker targets an extra-community path (left), in comparison to when targets are incrementally longer short paths (right). Plots include the average cost (solid line) and the cost range across trials (shaded area), as well as the average zero-sum result (dash line). (The zero-sum procedure is only reported for SBM, it did not complete within 24 hours for AS.) Results are shown for SBM (top) and AS (bottom) graph. PATHDEFENSE yields lower relative cost in the case where the target path is incrementally longer than the true shortest path than in the extra-community case.

### 6 Conclusion

This paper presents a framework and algorithms for defending against shortest path attacks. We formulate the defense as a Stackelberg game in which the defender alters the weights of the graph before the attacker removes edges to make the target path shortest. The defender's cost includes components to limit the average distance traveled by users, the error in the published distances, and the probability of attacker success. We show that the zero-sum version of this problem is NP-hard and provide a greedy edge weight increment procedure to find a feasible point. Using this same procedure in the more general context, we propose the PATHDEFENSE algorithm and apply it to several real and synthetic datasets. Across a wide set of experiments, we observe that PATHDEFENSE reduces the attack probability to a negligible level (typically less than  $10^{-6}$ ) while only slightly increasing the cost borne by users (by less than 5% in over 87% of cases).

### References

 Ahuja, R.K., Orlin, J.B.: Inverse optimization. Operations Research 49(5), 771–783 (2001)

- [2] Archer, A., Tardos, É.: Frugal path mechanisms. ACM Transactions on Algorithms 3(1), 1–22 (2007)
- [3] Arora, R., Upadhyay, J.: On differentially private graph sparsification and applications. NeurIPS (2019)
- [4] Backstrom, L., Dwork, C., Kleinberg, J.: Wherefore art thou R3579X? Anonymized social networks, hidden patterns, and structural steganography. In: WWW. pp. 181–190 (2007)
- [5] Bhagat, S., Cormode, G., Krishnamurthy, B., Srivastava, D.: Class-based graph anonymization for social network data. In: VLDB. pp. 766–777 (2009)
- [6] Blocki, J., Blum, A., Datta, A., Sheffet, O.: The Johnson-Lindenstrauss transform itself preserves differential privacy. In: FOCS. pp. 410–419 (2012)
- [7] Brandão, M., Coles, A., Magazzeni, D.: Explaining path plan optimality: Fast explanation methods for navigation meshes using full and incremental inverse optimization. In: ICAPS. vol. 31, pp. 56–64 (2021)
- [8] Chen, R., Fung, B., Yu, P.S., Desai, B.C.: Correlated network data publication via differential privacy. The VLDB Journal 23(4), 653–676 (2014)
- [9] Colizza, V., Pastor-Satorras, R., Vespignani, A.: Reaction-diffusion processes and metapopulation models in heterogeneous networks. Nature Physics 3(4), 276–282 (2007)
- [10] Deaconu, A., Ciupala, L.: Inverse minimum cut problem with lower and upper bounds. Mathematics 8(9), 1494 (2020)
- [11] Dwork, C.: Differential privacy: A survey of results. In: TAMC. pp. 1–19 (2008)
- [12] Elkind, E., Sahai, A., Steiglitz, K.: Frugality in path auctions. In: SODA. pp. 701–709 (2004)
- [13] Gallotti, R., Barthelemy, M.: The multilayer temporal network of public transport in Great Britain. Scientific Data 2(1), 1–8 (2015)
- [14] Gao, J., Yu, J.X., Jin, R., Zhou, J., Wang, T., Yang, D.: Neighborhoodprivacy protected shortest distance computing in cloud. In: SIGMOD. pp. 409–420 (2011)
- [15] Isella, L., Stehlé, J., Barrat, A., Cattuto, C., Pinton, J.F., Van den Broeck, W.: What's in a crowd? analysis of face-to-face behavioral networks. Journal of Theoretical Biology 271(1), 166–180 (2011)
- [16] Jiang, Y., Liu, L., Wu, B., Yao, E.: Inverse minimum cost flow problems under the weighted hamming distance. European Journal of Operational Research 207(1), 50–54 (2010)

- [17] La Fontaine, S., Muralidhar, N., Clifford, M., Eliassi-Rad, T., Nita-Rotaru, C.: Alternative route-based attacks in metropolitan traffic systems. In: DSN-W. pp. 20–27 (2022)
- [18] Leskovec, J., Kleinberg, J., Faloutsos, C.: Graphs over time: Densification laws, shrinking diameters and possible explanations. In: KDD. pp. 177–187 (2005)
- [19] Liu, K., Terzi, E.: Towards identity anonymization on graphs. In: SIG-MOD. pp. 93–106 (2008)
- [20] Liu, L., Zhang, J.: Inverse maximum flow problems under the weighted Hamming distance. Journal of Combinatorial Optimization 12(4), 395–408 (2006)
- [21] Miller, B.A., Shafi, Z., Ruml, W., Vorobeychik, Y., Eliassi-Rad, T., Alfeld, S.: PATHATTACK: Attacking shortest paths in complex networks. In: ECML PKDD. pp. 532–547 (2021)
- [22] Sealfon, A.: Shortest paths and distances with differential privacy. In: PODS. pp. 29–41 (2016)
- [23] Tayyebi, J., Massoud, A.: Efficient algorithms for the reverse shortest path problem on trees under the Hamming distance. Yugoslav Journal of Operations Research 27(1), 46–60 (2016)
- [24] Zhang, J., Ma, Z., Yang, C.: A column generation method for inverse shortest path problems. Zeitschrift f
  ür Operations Research 41(3), 347– 358 (1995)
- [25] Zhou, B., Pei, J.: Preserving privacy in social networks against neighborhood attacks. In: ICDE. pp. 506–515 (2008)

### A Notation Table

Table 1 lists the notation used in the paper.

## **B** Computing Defender Cost

Psuedocode to compute the defender cost is shown in Algorithm 3.

### C Proof of Theorem 2

We begin with the graph as described in Section 3.2. Pseudocode for creating this graph is provided in Algorithm 4.

Given a graph as constructed by Algorithm 4, consider each of the triangles  $\{u_{i-1}, \omega_i, u_i\}$  individually. To make  $p^*$  shortest, the defender will have to cut

Symbol	Meaning
G	graph
V	vertex set
E	edge set
N	number of vertices
M	number of edges
s	source vertex
t	destination vertex
$p^*$	adversary's target path
b	adversary's budget
$\mathcal{D}$	distribution of source/destination pairs
$\mathcal{P}$	distribution of target paths
B	distribution of attacker's budget
$\mathcal{G}$	distribution of graphs a user might see
$\mathcal{X}(G, w, p^*)$	set of attacks against graph $G$ with weights $w$ that make
	$p^*$ the shortest path between its endpoints
w(e)	true edge weight function $w: E \to \mathbb{R}_{>0}$
w'(e)	published weight function $w: E \to \mathbb{R}_{>0}$
c(e)	edge removal cost function $c: E \to \mathbb{R}_+$
$\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$	set of nonnegative real numbers
w	true edge weight vector
$\mathbf{w}'$	published edge weight vector
с	edge removal cost vector
$f_+$	defender's marginal cost of overestimating user path length
$f_{-}$	defender's marginal cost of underestimating user path length
с	vector of edge removal costs
Δ	binary vector representing edges cut
$\mathbf{x}_p$	binary vector representing edges in path $p$
$\ell(G, w, p)$	length of path $p$ in graph $G$ with weights $w$
p(G, w, s, t)	shortest path from $s$ to $t$ in $G$ using weights $w$
$P_{p^*}$	set of paths from s to t no longer than $p^*$
$E_p$	set of edges on path $p$
$(\cdot)^{\top}$	matrix or vector transpose
$\langle k \rangle$	average degree in $G$
$\sigma_k$	standard deviation of node degrees in $G$
$\kappa$	global clustering coefficient in $G$
au	transitivity in $G$
Δ	number of triangles in $G$
$\varphi$	number of connected components in $G$

Table 1: Notation used throughout the paper.

#### Algorithm 3 Compute defender cost

**Input**: graph G = (V, E), true weights w, published weights w', budget dist.  $\mathcal{B}, p^*$  dist.  $\mathcal{P}, (s, t)$  pair dist.  $\mathcal{D},$  attack cost  $\lambda$ **Output**: cost c1:  $c \leftarrow 0$ . 2: for all  $(s,t) \in V \times V$  do  $p \leftarrow p(G, w', s, t)$  {all-pairs shortest path} 3:  $d_{G,s,t} \leftarrow \ell(G, w, p)$ 4:  $d'_{G.s.t} \leftarrow \ell(G, w', p)$ 5:6: end for 7: for all  $p^*$  in  $\mathcal{P}$  do  $p_{\text{path}} \leftarrow \Pr_{P \sim \mathcal{P}}[P = p^*]$ 8:  $E' \leftarrow \mathsf{PATHATTACK}(G, w', p^*)$ 9:  $b_{\text{temp}} \leftarrow |E'|$ 10: $p_{\text{attack}} \leftarrow \Pr_{B \sim \mathcal{B}}[B \le b_{\text{temp}}]$ 11:if  $p_{\text{attack}} > 0$  then 12: $G' \leftarrow (V, E \setminus E')$ 13:for all  $(s,t) \in V \times V$  do 14: $p \leftarrow p(G', w', s, t)$  {all-pairs shortest path} 15: $d_{G',s,t} \leftarrow \ell(G',w,p)$ 16: $d'_{G',s,t} \gets \ell(G',w',p)$ 17: $p_{\text{pair}} \leftarrow \Pr_{D \sim \mathcal{D}}[D = (s, t)]$ 18: $L_d \leftarrow p_{\text{path}} \cdot p_{\text{attack}} \cdot p_{\text{pair}} \cdot d_{G',s,t}$ 19: $L_e \leftarrow p_{\text{path}} \cdot p_{\text{attack}} \cdot p_{\text{pair}} \cdot c_{\text{err}} \left( d_{G',s,t}, d'_{G',s,t} \right)$ 20:  $c \leftarrow c + L_d + L_e$ 21:end for 22: end if 23:if  $p_{\text{attack}} < 1$  then 24:for all  $(s,t) \in V \times V$  do 25: $p_{\text{pair}} \leftarrow \Pr_{(u,v) \sim \mathcal{D}}[(u,v) = (s,t)]$ 26: $\hat{L}_d \leftarrow p_{\text{path}} \cdot (1 - p_{\text{attack}}) \cdot p_{\text{pair}} \cdot d_{G,s,t}$ 27: $L_e \leftarrow p_{\text{path}} \cdot (1 - p_{\text{attack}}) \cdot p_{\text{pair}} \cdot c_{\text{err}} \left( d_{G,s,t}, d'_{G,s,t} \right)$ 28: 29:  $c \leftarrow c + L_d + L_e$ end for 30: end if 31:  $c \leftarrow c + \lambda \cdot p_{\text{attack}}$ 32: 33: end for 34: return c

Algorithm 4 Construct Zero-Sum Cut Defense problem from Knapsack

**Input**: item values  $\{\nu_1, \dots, \nu_n\} \subset \mathbb{Z}_+$ , item weights  $\{\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n\} \subset \mathbb{Z}_+$ , value threshold U, weight threshold H

**Output:** graph G = (V, E), true weights w, edge removal costs c, budget dist.  $\mathcal{B}, p^*$  dist.  $\mathcal{P}, (s, t)$  pair dist.  $\mathcal{D}$ , error costs  $(f_+, f_-)$ 

1:  $V \leftarrow \{u_0\}, E \leftarrow \emptyset$ 2: for  $i \leftarrow 1$  to n do  $V \leftarrow V \cup \{u_i, \omega_i\}$ 3:  $E \leftarrow E \cup \{\{u_{i-1}, \omega_i\}, \{u_{i-1}, u_i\}, \{u_i, \omega_i\}\}\}$ 4: 5:  $w(\{u_{i-1}, u_i\}) \leftarrow 1$  $c(\{u_{i-1}, u_i\}) \leftarrow 1$ 6:  $w(\{u_{i-1},\omega_i\}) \leftarrow 1$ 7:  $c(\{u_{i-1},\omega_i\}) \leftarrow \nu_i$ 8:  $w(\{u_i, \omega_i\}) \leftarrow \eta_i$ 9:  $c(\{u_i, \omega_i\}) \leftarrow \nu_i$ 10:11: **end for** 11: end for 12:  $\mathcal{B} \leftarrow \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } b = U - 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$ 13:  $\mathcal{P} \leftarrow \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } p^* = (u_0, u_1, \cdots, u_{n-1}, u_n) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$ 14:  $\mathcal{D} \leftarrow \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } (s, t) = (u_0, u_n) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$ 15:  $f_1 \leftarrow 1$ 15:  $f_+ \leftarrow 1$ 16:  $f_{-} \leftarrow \sum_{i=1}^{N} \eta_i$ 17: return  $G = (V, E), w, c, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{D}, (f_+, f, -)$ 

either  $\{u_{i-1}, \omega_i\}$  or  $\{\omega_i, u_i\}$ , thus incurring cost  $\nu_i$ , any time  $\{u_{i-1}, u_i\}$  is not the shortest path from  $u_{i-1}$  to  $u_i$ , i.e., when

$$w'(\{u_{i-1}, u_i\}) \ge w'(\{u_{i-1}, \omega_i\}) + w'(\{\omega_i, u_i\}).$$
(31)

If (31) does not hold, then  $\{u_{i-1}, u_i\}$  is the shortest path from  $u_{i-1}$  to  $u_i$ , so the attacker will not remove any edges in triangle  $\{u_{i-1}, \omega_i, u_i\}$ . This observation yields the following lemma.

**Lemma 1.** The attacker will cut an edge in  $\{u_{i-1}, \omega_i, u_i\}$ , incurring a cost of  $v_i$ , if and only if (31) holds.

In terms of the defender's cost, we show that if the defender forces the attacker to remove an edge from triangle i, the minimum cost is  $\eta_i$ .

**Lemma 2.** The optimal defender cost when a user travels from  $u_{i-1}$  to  $u_i$  is

$$L_d + L_e = \begin{cases} \eta_i + 1 & \text{if (31) holds} \\ 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$
 (32)

Furthermore, the optimal solution only perturbs edges  $\{u_{i-1}, u_i\}$ , the edges along  $p^*$ .

*Proof.* In the present context, it is always possible to reduce the probability of attack to zero. Thus, we will focus on the case where no attack occurs. Let  $\delta$  be difference between the true and published distance for the path  $(u_{i-1}, u_i)$  (i.e., the published distance is  $1 + \delta$ ) and  $\epsilon$  be the same for path  $(u_{i-1}, \omega_i, u_i)$  (published distance  $1 + \eta_i + \epsilon$ ). Recall that the marginal increase in cost for publishing a longer distance than the user experiences is 1, while the marginal cost increase for publishing shorter distances is H'. If equality holds in (31), either path may be taken, so we consider all possible costs. Note that, in this case,  $\delta = \eta_i + \epsilon$ .

- If  $\delta \ge 0$  and  $\epsilon \ge 0$ , then the cost of taking  $(u_{i-1}, u_i)$  is  $1 + \delta = 1 + \eta_i + \epsilon \ge 1 + \eta_i$ . The cost of taking  $(u_{i-1}, \omega_i, u_i)$  is  $1 + \eta_i + \epsilon \ge 1 + \eta_i$ .
- If  $\delta \ge 0$  and  $\epsilon < 0$ , then the cost of taking  $(u_{i-1}, u_i)$  is  $1 + \delta = 1 + \eta_i + \epsilon < 1 + \eta_i$ , but the cost of taking  $(u_{i-1}, \omega_i, u_i)$  is  $1 + \eta_i + H'|\epsilon| > 1 + \eta_i$ .
- If  $\delta < 0$  and  $\epsilon < 0$ , then the cost of taking  $(u_{i-1}, u_i)$  is  $1+H'|\delta|$ , which may be smaller than  $1+\eta_i$ , but the cost of taking  $(u_{i-1}, \omega_i, u_i)$  is  $1+\eta_i+H'|\epsilon| > 1+\eta_i$ .

The first case is the only one where the cost is never strictly above  $1 + \eta_i$ , so this cases optimizes the worst-case cost. It achieves the lower bound only when  $\epsilon = 0$  and  $\delta = \eta_i$ .

If equality does not hold in (31), then the path  $(u_{i-1}, \omega_i, u_i)$  is taken from  $u_{i-1}$  to  $u_i$ . The cost is minimized when no edge weight along this path is perturbed, and the cost is  $1 + \eta_i$ .

If (31) does not hold, the user will take path  $(u_{i-1}, u_i)$ . As in the previous case, cost is minimized when no perturbation takes place, yielding a cost of 1.

We now introduce the full reduction from Knapsack to Zero-Sum Cut Defense. We start by creating the Zero-Sum Cut Defense problem using Algorithm 4. We run Zero-Sum Cut Defense on this graph and check each of its triangles  $\{u_{i-1}, \omega_i, u_i\}$ . If the published weight of edge  $\{u_{i-1}, \omega_i, u_i\}$  is greater than its true weight, we add the item to the knapsack. If the total weight of the items is no more than the prescribed threshold, we return true; the answer to the decision question is yes. Otherwise, we return false. Pseudocode for the reduction is provided in Algorithm 5.

This reduction solves the Knapsack problem, as we formally prove now.

**Lemma 3.** Algorithm 5 returns true if and only if there is a subset of items whose weights sum to no more than H and value sums to at least U.

*Proof.* If there is a subset  $X \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$  where  $\sum_{i \in X} \nu_i \geq U$  and  $\sum_{i \in X} \eta_i \leq H$ , then one solution to Zero-Sum Cut Defense is to increase the edge weight on  $\{u_{i-1}, u_i\}$  by at least  $\eta_i$  for all  $i \in X$ . This will result in a case where the

Algorithm 5 Reduction from Knapsack to Zero-Sum Cut Defense

**Input**: item values  $\{\nu_1, \dots, \nu_n\} \subset \mathbb{Z}_+$ , item weights  $\{\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n\} \subset \mathbb{Z}_+$ , value threshold  $U \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ , weight threshold  $H \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ **Output**: Boolean value indicating answer  $\operatorname{to}$ Knapsack 1:  $G, w, c, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{D}, (f_+, f_-) \leftarrow \text{Algorithm } 4(\{\nu_1, \cdots, \nu_n\}, \{\eta_1, \cdots, \eta_n\}, U, H)$ 2:  $w' \leftarrow \text{Zero-Sum Cut Defense}(G, w, c, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{D}, (f_+, f_-))$ 3:  $\eta_{\text{total}} \leftarrow 0$ 4: for  $i \leftarrow 1$  to n do if  $w'(\{(u_{i-1}, u_i)\}) > w(\{(u_{i-1}, u_i)\})$  then 5:6:  $\eta_{\text{total}} \leftarrow \eta_{\text{total}} + \eta_i$ 7:end if 8: end for 9: if  $\eta_{\text{total}} \leq H$  then return true 10: 11: else return false 12:13: end if

attacker must spend at least U to be effective: By Lemma 1, the attacker must remove an edge with removal cost  $\nu_i$  for all  $i \in X$ , yielding a required attack budget of at least U by our assumption, thus exceeding the budget constructed in Algorithm 4. By Lemma 2, the cost to the defender of each perturbation will increase by  $\eta_i$ , which we also assume will sum to at most H. Since such a defense exists, the minimum-cost defense must have cost no more than H. Thus, if there is a solution to Knapsack, Algorithm 5 will return true.

Now suppose that there is no such set, but Algorithm 5 returns true. For the attack probability to be zero, the optimal attack must cost at least U. Let E' be the edges cut in an optimal attack. All edges will be of the form  $\{u_{i-1}, \omega_i\}$  or  $\{\omega_i, u_i\}$ , since all edges  $\{u_{i-1}, u_i\}$  are part of  $p^*$ . There will never be an optimal attack that removes both  $\{u_{i-1}, \omega_i\}$  and  $\{\omega_i, u_i\}$ : this would increase the cost of the attack and not remove any competing paths. Thus, let  $Y \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$  be the indices of the triangles that are cut, i.e.,

$$i \in Y \iff \{u_{i-1}, \omega_i\} \in E' \text{ or } \{\omega_i, u_i\} \in E'.$$

Since the defense minimizes the attack probability, we have  $\sum_{i \in Y} \nu_i \geq U$ . By Lemma 1, we know that these edges will be cut only if (31) holds, i.e., it holds for all  $i \in Y$  and not for any  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus Y$ . From Lemma 2, we know that the cost is optimized in this case by perturbing  $w(\{u_{i-1}, u\})$ , increasing it by  $\eta_i$ . Thus,  $\eta_{\text{total}} = \sum_{i \in Y} \eta_i$ . Algorithm 5 returns true only if  $\eta_{\text{total}} \leq H$ . However, this contradicts our assumption that there is no solution to Knapsack: Y is a set of items with weight no more than H and value at least U. Thus, when there is no solution to Knapsack, Algorithm 5 will return false. Using these intermediate results, we now prove the original theorem.

Proof of Theorem 2. Lemma 3 shows that Algorithm 5 is a reduction from Knapsack to Zero-Sum Cut Defense. Constructing the graph includes n iterations of a loop, each of which performs a sub-linear amount of work. Thus, the loop completes in polynomial time. Creating the distributions requires at most linear time, and computing the marginal cost of error takes linear time. Thus, Algorithm 5 is a polynomial-time reduction from Knapsack to Zero-Sum Cut Defense. Since Knapsack is an NP-hard problem, this implies that Zero-Sum Cut Defense is NP-hard as well.

### **D** Dataset Features

We use the following datasets in our experiments:

- ER: Erdős–Rényi random graphs where each pair of nodes shares an edge with probability 0.048.
- BA: Barabási–Albert graphs where incoming nodes attach with 6 edges.
- WS: Watts-Strogatz graphs with rewiring probability 0.05.
- SBM: Stochastic blockmodel (SBM) graphs where nodes are separated into a 200-node cluster with internal connection probability 0.06 and a 50-node cluster with connection probability 0.2, and two nodes in different clusters share an edge with probability 0.005.
- USAIR: Nodes are 500 airports in the United States, edge weights are the total numbers of seats on all flights between them. Available at https://toreopsahl.com/datasets/#usairports.
- UKMET: Nodes are metro stops and weights are the average travel time between the stops. We take the largest strongly connected component and make it undirected by averaging the weights in each direction. Available at https://datadryad.org/stash/dataset/doi:10.5061/dryad.pc8m3.
- HT: Nodes are attendees at the ACM Hypertext 2009 conference, and edges are the number of interactions between people over the course of the two days. Available at http://www.sociopatterns.org/datasets/hypertext-2009-dynamic-contact-network/.
- AS: Nodes are routers and edges are connections between them (dated 11 Dec. 1999). Available at http://snap.stanford.edu/data/as-733.htm l.

Statistics of the datasets are provided in Table 2.

Network	V	E	$\langle k \rangle$	$\sigma_k$	$\kappa$	au	$\triangle$
ER	250	1498.3	11.986	3.352	0.048	0.047	280.6
		$\pm 32.885$	$\pm 0.263$	$\pm 0.144$	$\pm 0.003$	$\pm 0.002$	$\pm 18.645$
BA	250	1464.0	11.712	9.345	0.122	0.099	878.1
		$\pm 0.0$	$\pm 0.0$	$\pm 0.272$	$\pm 0.006$	$\pm 0.003$	$\pm 36.585$
WS	250	1500.0	12.0	0.774	0.586	0.582	3214.4
		$\pm 0.0$	$\pm 0.0$	$\pm 0.063$	$\pm 0.013$	$\pm 0.013$	$\pm 71.256$
SBM	250	1479.2	11.834	3.264	0.079	0.073	424.5
		$\pm 36.13$	$\pm 0.289$	$\pm 0.167$	$\pm 0.004$	$\pm 0.005$	$\pm 47.124$
AS	1477	3142	4.254	15.814	0.242	0.038	2530
HT	113	2196	38.867	18.350	0.534	0.495	16867
USAIR	500	2980	11.92	22.338	0.617	0.351	41583
UKMET	298	349	2.342	1.031	0.042	0.086	18

Table 2: Properties of the synthetic and real networks used in our experiments. For each random graph model, we generate 10 networks. Note that the number of edges across the different synthetic networks is  $\approx 1500$ . The table shows the average degree ( $\langle k \rangle$ ), standard deviation of the degree ( $\sigma_k$ ), average clustering coefficient ( $\kappa$ ), transitivity ( $\tau$ ), and number of triangles ( $\Delta$ ). Each graph has a single connected component. The  $\pm$  values show the standard deviation across 10 runs of each random graph model.

# E Extended Experimental Results

Here we provide additional experimental results. Results where all the target paths have the same endpoints are shown in Fig. 5 and Fig. 6 for synthetic and real graphs, respectively. Results where each target's endpoints are chosen independently of one another are shown in Fig. 7 (synthetic) and Fig. 8 (real).



Figure 5: Cost of PATHDEFENSE for all synthetic datasets under various conditions. Each row plots the results for a different dataset, and results are shown for the original budget and  $\lambda$  (left column), when the attacker budget is doubled (center column), and when the cost of attacker success is reduced by five times (right column). All target paths use the same terminal nodes. Plots include the average cost (solid line) and the cost range across trials (shaded area), as well as the average zero-sum result (dash line). There is greater variation in normalized cost than in the synthetic cases, and the UKMET graph in particular shows that maintaining a minimal attack probability may greatly increase the defender's cost.



Figure 6: Cost of PATHDEFENSE for all real datasets under various conditions. Each row plots the results for a different dataset, and results are shown for the original budget and  $\lambda$  (left column), when the attacker budget is doubled (center column), and when the cost of attacker success is reduced by five times (right column). All target paths use the same terminal nodes. Plots include the average cost (solid line) and the cost range across trials (shaded area), as well as the average zero-sum result (dash line), with the exception of the AS graph, where the zero-sum procedure did not complete in 24 hours and are omitted. Running PATHDEFENSE on both transportation graphs yield a decrease in cost followed by an increase, while the cost with the computer and social networks decrease and become stable when the cost of adversary success  $\lambda$  is high. When  $\lambda$  is lowered, PATHDEFENSE yields a cost increase after about 100 iterations, with the defender eventually selecting the result of an early iteration.



Figure 7: Cost of PATHDEFENSE for all synthetic datasets under various conditions. Each row plots the results for a different dataset, and results are shown for the original budget and  $\lambda$  (left column), when the attacker budget is doubled (center column), and when the cost of attacker success is reduced by five times (right column). All target paths use different terminal nodes. Plots include the average cost (solid line) and the cost range across trials (shaded area), as well as the average zero-sum result (dash line). The variation in cost is lower than in the case where all target paths have the same endpoints, likely due to less interference between perturbations for different targets (i.e., a perturbation making one target more difficult to attack is less likely to make another target easier).



Figure 8: Cost of PATHDEFENSE for all real datasets under various conditions. Each row plots the results for a different dataset, and results are shown for the original budget and  $\lambda$  (left column), when the attacker budget is doubled (center column), and when the cost of attacker success is reduced by five times (right column). All target paths use different terminal nodes. Plots include the average cost (solid line) and the cost range across trials (shaded area), as well as the average zero-sum result (dash line), with the exception of the AS graph, where the zero-sum procedure did not complete in 24 hours and are omitted. As in synthetic graphs, the cost variation is lower than in the case where targets share endpoints, though we see some similar qualitative phenomena (large increase in cost for USAIR and UKMET).