

Approximating the Core via Iterative Coalition Sampling

Ian Gemp
Google DeepMind
London, United Kingdom
imgemp@google.com

Marc Lanctot
Google DeepMind
Montreal, Canada
lanctot@google.com

Luke Marris
Google DeepMind
London, United Kingdom
marris@google.com

Yiran Mao
Google DeepMind
London, United Kingdom
yiranm@google.com

Edgar Duéñez-Guzmán
Google DeepMind
London, United Kingdom
duenez@google.com

Sarah Perrin
Google DeepMind
Paris, France
sarahperrin@google.com

Andras Gyorgy
Google DeepMind
London, United Kingdom
agyorgy@google.com

Romuald Elie
Google DeepMind
Paris, France
relie@google.com

Georgios Piliouras
Google DeepMind
London, United Kingdom
gpil@google.com

Michael Kaisers
Google DeepMind
Paris, France
mkaisers@google.com

Daniel Hennes
Google DeepMind
Zürich, Switzerland
hennes@google.com

Kalesha Bullard
Google DeepMind
London, United Kingdom
ksbullard@google.com

Kate Larson
Google DeepMind
Montreal, Canada
katelarsen@google.com

Yoram Bachrach
Google DeepMind
London, United Kingdom
yorambac@google.com

ABSTRACT

The core is a central solution concept in cooperative game theory, defined as the set of feasible allocations or payments such that no subset of agents has incentive to break away and form their own subgroup or coalition. However, it has long been known that the core (and approximations, such as the least-core) are hard to compute. This limits our ability to analyze cooperative games in general, and to fully embrace cooperative game theory contributions in domains such as explainable AI (XAI), where the core can complement the Shapley values to identify influential features or instances supporting predictions by black-box models. We propose novel iterative algorithms for computing variants of the core, which avoid the computational bottleneck of many other approaches; namely solving large linear programs. As such, they scale better to very large problems as we demonstrate across different classes of cooperative games, including weighted voting games, induced subgraph games, and marginal contribution networks. We also explore our algorithms in the context of XAI, providing further evidence of the power of the core for such applications.

KEYWORDS

Cooperative Game Theory; Core; Explainable AI

ACM Reference Format:

Ian Gemp, Marc Lanctot, Luke Marris, Yiran Mao, Edgar Duéñez-Guzmán, Sarah Perrin, Andras Gyorgy, Romuald Elie, Georgios Piliouras, Michael Kaisers, Daniel Hennes, Kalesha Bullard, Kate Larson, and Yoram Bachrach. 2024. Approximating the Core via Iterative Coalition Sampling. In *Proc. of the 23rd International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems (AAMAS 2024)*, Auckland, New Zealand, May 6 – 10, 2024, IFAAMAS, 15 pages.

1 INTRODUCTION

Coalitional game theory studies games played by self-interested players where incentives are aligned and fully-binding contracts are supported [21]. The utility achieved depends on which group, *i.e.*, which *coalition*, of players is formed to solve the game. The key problem that researchers have focused on is how this total utility should be divided among the individual members of the team. Several solution concepts have been proposed to address this question, with the core [40] and the Shapley value [70] being among the best known. The Shapley value quantifies the contribution of each individual player via the differences in value obtained over all possible subgroups which include and exclude that player. In contrast, the core is a rough cooperative analogue of the Nash equilibrium: a utility division that is stable, *i.e.*, no subset of players has incentive to deviate from the chosen coalition.

Cooperative game theory has found many applications, ranging from analyzing power in decision making bodies and political settings [71], through predicting how players may share team payoffs

or costs [32, 53] to risk attribution [73]. One prominent application of cooperative game theory is in analyzing what drives the predictions of machine learning models. As more of our decisions are now informed by learned models, it is crucial to understand *why* our models output what they do, which is the main goal of explainable AI (XAI) [13]. The Shapley value has been adopted in the machine learning community to explain model predictions [54]: the features are treated as players, and the payoff to a coalition is the output of the model when training exclusively on the subset of input features in the coalition. The Shapley value then computes the marginal contribution of each feature to the output, offering additive explanations for the effect of each feature on prediction.

However, there are some limitations regarding Shapley values: it may produce counter-intuitive explanations [72], behavioral studies have shown the core can be more predictive of human payment divisions, and accurate estimation requires many samples [6, 55, 56]¹. As such, the core has been recently motivated as a possible alternative to Shapley values for XAI [78]. Unlike Shapley values, the core focuses on stability [21]: a payment division is *stable* if no player has incentive to deviate from the coalition and form a different one on their own. Consequently, core payments may better reflect each player’s “market value” [25, 68].

A key barrier to applying cooperative game theory in practice is the high computational cost associated with calculating the various solution concepts, which may be hard to compute even for very restricted forms of cooperative games [21]. For some solutions, such as the Shapley value and other power indices, there exist efficient approximation algorithms [16, 20], e.g., an approximate form of the Shapley value can be computed using Monte Carlo sampling [6, 39, 56], which might explain its wide adoption.

In contrast, solutions based on the core have proved to be more elusive; there exist multiple approaches that can approximate or exactly solve for the core, but can only be applied to very restricted classes of coalition games [5, 35, 48, 49]. Computing the core exactly requires solving a linear program (LP) with an exponential number of constraints (one per each possible subset of the agents). Alternatively, assuming access to incrementally sampled coalition values, bounds can be given for likely stable payments that relate to the core [11]. A recent breakthrough in approximating the core is a Monte Carlo algorithm that samples coalitions in this way, yielding probabilistic bounds on approximation quality [78]. This approach significantly expands the set of games for which one can tractably approximate the core, albeit it still requires solving LPs, where the size of the LP grows linearly in the number of samples.

Our contribution: In this paper, we introduce novel iterative algorithms for the core. None of our algorithms require solving a linear program: as such, they enjoy greater scaling potential to very large problems. We demonstrate this efficiency in practice across several classes of coalition games including weighted voting games [35], induced subgraph games [28], marginal contribution networks [45], and apply them to feature-importance and data-valuation problems arising in XAI [13].

2 BACKGROUND

The central concept in cooperative game theory is that of a *coalition*. Given a set of n agents, $I = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, a coalition is a subset of agents, $C \subseteq I$, where the *grand coalition* is the coalition containing all agents in I . A coalitional game, G , is further coupled with a characteristic function, $v : 2^I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that assigns a real value to each coalition of agents, representing the total utility that the coalition of agents achieve together. We study transferable utility games, where $v(C)$ is interpreted as value that is to be shared and transferred between members of the coalition C . As is standard, $v(\emptyset) = 0$.

The characteristic function only defines the gains a coalition can achieve; it does not define how these gains are distributed among the coalition members. An *imputation* (also called payoff vector) $p = (p_1, \dots, p_n)$ is a division of the gains of the grand coalition I among the agents, where $p_i \geq 0$, such that $\sum_{i=1}^n p_i = v(I)$. We call p_i the payoff of agent i , and denote the payoff of a coalition C as $p(C) = \sum_{i \in C} p_i$.

A basic requirement for a good imputation is *individual rationality*, which states that for all agents $i \in C$, we have $p_i \geq v(\{i\})$; otherwise, some agent has incentives to work alone instead. Similarly, we say a coalition B *blocks* imputation (p_1, \dots, p_n) if $p(B) < v(B)$, since the members of B can split from the original coalition, derive the gains of $v(B)$ by working together and then reallocate this *excess*, $v(B) - p(B) > 0$, to agents in B . This incentive to break away and form new coalitions leads to instability and has long been a focus of cooperative game theory. The most prominent solution concept is that of the core [40].

DEFINITION 1. *The core of a coalitional game G is the set of all imputations that are not blocked by any coalition. That is it contains imputation $p = (p_1, \dots, p_n)$ if and only if for all $C \subseteq I$, $p(C) \geq v(C)$.*

Unfortunately, the core can be empty, meaning that for every imputation, there exists a blocking coalition. Thus, relaxations of the core are often studied by, for example, assuming that the gains made by forming a blocking coalition are small. The ϵ -core allows for such slight relaxations of the inequalities in the core definition.

DEFINITION 2. *Given ϵ , the ϵ -core of coalitional game G is the set of all imputations such that for any $C \subseteq I$, $p(C) \geq v(C) - \epsilon$, i.e., ϵ -core $\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{(p_1, \dots, p_n) \mid p(C) \geq v(C) - \epsilon \forall C \subseteq I\}$.*

Clearly, for large enough values of ϵ , the ϵ -core is non-empty. Furthermore, if $\epsilon = 0$, the definition of the ϵ -core is equivalent to the core. A natural question is what is the smallest ϵ such that the ϵ -core is non-empty. Given a game G we consider the set $\{\epsilon \mid \text{the } \epsilon\text{-core of } G \text{ is not empty}\}$. It is easy to see that this set is compact, and thus has a minimal element ϵ_{min} .

DEFINITION 3. *Given coalitional game G , define $\epsilon_{min} = \min\{\epsilon \mid \epsilon\text{-core of } G \text{ is non-empty}\}$. The least core of G is the ϵ_{min} -core of G , and this value ϵ_{min} is called the Least-Core Value (LCV) of G .*

3 APPROXIMATING THE CORE THROUGH ITERATIVE PAYOFF ADJUSTMENTS VIA COALITION SAMPLING

Earlier work has shown that given a game G , checking if the core is non-empty is *NP-hard* [28] and, furthermore, that computing the

¹See Appendix B for a more comprehensive discussion of the differences between the Shapley value and the core.

least-core exactly is impossible [12]. This opens up the question we address in this section; how to best approximate the least core.

The least-core can be formulated as a linear programming (LP) problem. Let c be a binary coalition-membership vector for coalition C such that $c_i = 1$ if $i \in C$ and 0 otherwise. When clear from the context we sometimes use c to represent coalition C . Furthermore, without loss of generality, assume that $v(I) = 1$, re-scaling v with a factor $\frac{1}{v(I)}$ if necessary. Then the least-core problem is to solve

$$\min_{p, \epsilon} \quad \epsilon \quad (1)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad v(c) - \epsilon - p^\top c \leq 0 \quad \forall c \quad (2)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n p_i = 1 \quad (3)$$

$$p_i \geq 0 \quad \forall i \in I. \quad (4)$$

The challenge is that the Constraint 2 relates to 2^n coalitions, making it infeasible to solve for games with many players. A recent method to approximating the least-core randomly samples some number of the constraints imposed on the coalitions and solves the resulting LP [78]. However, even when only using sub-sampled constraints, solving LPs is still time consuming.² We present alternative iterative algorithms that avoid the requirement of solving the LP, circumventing a significant computational bottleneck.

Our algorithms are presented in increasing complexity. Our first two algorithms, Iterative Projections (Section 3.1) and Stochastic Subgradient Descent (Section 3.2) take a given value of ϵ and seek an imputation in the ϵ -core (assuming the ϵ -core is non-empty). In order to compute the least-core, one may apply an outer loop that calls these methods so as to perform a binary search for the minimal value ϵ_{min} yielding a non-empty ϵ_{min} -core. Our Core Lagrangian method (Section 3.3) directly returns the least-core, including both the ϵ_{min} (least-core value), and an imputation in the ϵ_{min} -core. Our empirical results in Section 4 are reported for this algorithm alone.

3.1 The ϵ -Core via Iterative Projections

We observe that each Constraint 2 on p represents a half-space, namely a convex set. Assuming that there exists some p such that all constraints can be satisfied for a given ϵ , the corresponding constraint satisfaction problem is to find p such that Constraint 2 is satisfied. This is equivalent to solving a convex feasibility problem by finding a p on the $(n-1)$ -dimensional simplex Δ that lies within the intersection of all these convex sets, a problem that can be solved via von Neumann-Halperin method of cyclic alternating projections [10, 14, 30]. We start with an initial guess for p and then cycle through the constraints (for each coalition, C), iteratively modifying the guess by projecting it onto the feasible set represented by each individual constraint. We observe that the projection, $\text{Proj}_{c, \epsilon}(p)$, of an imputation p onto a half-space $p^\top c \geq v(C) - \epsilon$ has a closed

²Methods that guarantee polynomial runtime for solving LPs [47] have a runtime that is cubic in the number of parameters. An efficient implementation of the Simplex method [22] is much faster in practice, but is still time consuming for large LPs.

Algorithm 1 ϵ -Core via von Neumann-Halperin

Input: Number of iterations T

$$p_0 = \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{1}_n$$

for $t = 1 \leq T$ **do**

Select coalition C (cyclically) as binary vector c

$$d_c = \max(0, v(C) - \epsilon - p^\top c)$$

$$p_t \leftarrow p_{t-1} + \frac{d_c}{|C|} c$$

$$p_t \leftarrow \text{Proj}_{\Delta}(p_t)$$

end for

Output: p_T

form solution that can be computed efficiently:

$$\text{Proj}_{c, \epsilon}(p) = \begin{cases} p & v(C) - \epsilon - p^\top c \leq 0 \\ p - (p^\top c + \epsilon - v(C)) / \|c\|^2 c & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$= p + \frac{d_c}{|c|} c \quad \text{where } |c| = \text{the size of the coalition} \quad (5)$$

and where $d_c = \max(0, v(C) - \epsilon - p^\top c)$ is the deficit. If $v(C) - \epsilon - p^\top c < 0$, players in coalition C are being paid *more* than they are actually contributing (where the payment is $\epsilon + p^\top c$). Intuitively, players are incentivized to remain in a coalition if $d_c = 0$, otherwise, the coalition is unstable. Algorithm 1 formalizes this method.

THEOREM 1. *Let $v : 2^I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a characteristic function. Given an ϵ and assuming the ϵ -core exists, Algorithm 1 converges to an ϵ -core imputation asymptotically, i.e.: $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} p_T \rightarrow \epsilon\text{-core}(v)$.*

PROOF. We can appeal directly to classical convergence results of the von Neumann-Halperin cyclic projections algorithm [10]. \square

3.2 The ϵ -Core via Stochastic (Sub)Gradient Descent

While projecting an imputation p onto a hyperplane can be computed efficiently, cycling through all constraints is not, and it is also computationally expensive to update p on a batch of constraints as that involves projecting p into the intersection of a set of half-spaces. Instead, we propose a new approach that re-formulates the projection problem as an optimization problem and admits an efficient batch algorithm.

We define a loss function, $\ell_c(p, \epsilon)$ for each coalition C (represented by vector c):

$$\ell_c(p, \epsilon) = \frac{1}{2|c|} \left(\max(0, v(C) - \epsilon - p^\top c) \right)^2 = \frac{d_c^2}{2|c|}. \quad (6)$$

Observe that if $v(C) - \epsilon - p^\top c \leq 0$, $\ell_c = 0$, otherwise, we accrue some positive loss for not satisfying the constraint for coalition c . Furthermore, a valid negative (sub)gradient of ℓ_c with respect to p is exactly the update direction computed by the projection $\text{Proj}_{c, \epsilon}$ from equation (5):

$$-\nabla_p \ell_c = \frac{d_c}{|c|} c. \quad (7)$$

Therefore, if we run stochastic gradient descent (SGD) with learning rate equal to 1 on $\sum_c \ell_c(p)$, sampling one coalition at a time, we recover Algorithm 1. However, it is also possible to increase the minibatch size, sampling multiple coalitions at one

time, as shown in Algorithm 2. Theorem 2 shows that if Algorithm 2 returns an imputation that is approximately in the ϵ -core, then it provably lies in the ϵ' -core, albeit with $\epsilon' > \epsilon$. The proof can be found in Appendix A.1.

Algorithm 2 ϵ -Core via SGD

Input: Number of iterations T

Input: Batch size B

Input: Step size schedule η_t

$$p = \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{1}_n$$

for $t = 1 \leq T$ **do**

 Sample batch C_B containing B coalitions

 Compute average gradient over batch: $\nabla_p = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{C \in C_B} \nabla_p \ell_c$

$$p \leftarrow p - \eta_t \nabla_p$$

$$p \leftarrow \text{Proj}_\Delta(p)$$

end for

 Sample $t^* \in \{0, \dots, T\}$ according to $P(t^* = t) = \frac{\eta_t}{\sum_{t'} \eta_{t'}}$.

Output: p_{t^*}

THEOREM 2. *If $\ell_c(\epsilon, p) \leq \gamma^2$ for all c , then p is in the $(\epsilon + \sqrt{2n\gamma})$ -core.*

THEOREM 3. *Let $v : 2^I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a characteristic function. Given an ϵ and assuming the ϵ -core exists, Algorithm 2 converges to an ϵ -core imputation in expectation at a rate of $\mathcal{O}(T^{-1/4})$.*

PROOF. We can appeal directly to convergence rates of stochastic projected subgradient algorithms for convex optimization [24]. These rates prove Algorithm 2 converges to a stationary point with $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{T})$ expected squared gradient norm. Recall equation (7) to determine that the squared gradient is proportional to d_c^2 . Therefore, the violation of the core constraints, d_c , decays as $\mathcal{O}(T^{-1/4})$. \square

3.3 The Least-Core as a Saddle Point Problem

Algorithms 1 and 2 assume an ϵ is provided such that all constraints represented by Constraint 2 are satisfied.³ However, we are really interested in finding the smallest such ϵ for which the constraints still hold, i.e. the least-core value (LCV). To this end, we reformulate the original LP, making use of a single non-linear constraint:

$$\min_{p \in \Delta, \epsilon} \epsilon \quad (8)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{C \subseteq I} \ell_c(p, \epsilon) \leq \gamma^2 \quad (9)$$

for some constant $\gamma > 0$. Note that if $\gamma = 0$, we would recover the solution to the least-core LP in (1)-(4). For $\gamma > 0$, we can recover an approximate solution via Theorem 2. While this form is no longer an LP, it retains a crucial property: convexity. Each $\ell_c(p, \epsilon)$ is convex in p and ϵ , and hence the nonlinear constraint $\sum_{C \subseteq I} \ell_c(p, \epsilon) - \gamma^2$ remains convex in p and ϵ . Similarly Objective 8 is convex as it is linear in ϵ and p . This allows us to view the optimization problem as a saddle-point problem using Lagrange multipliers.⁴ We first observe that via Karush-Kuhn-Tucker conditions, convexity in the

³Recall that such an ϵ is guaranteed to exist.

⁴Note that we introduce the constant $\gamma > 0$ so as to ensure Slater's condition holds so as to meet the necessary and sufficient conditions for optimality of the subsequent saddle point solution [18].

objective and constraint is sufficient for optimality of the solution to the corresponding Lagrangian formulation (see Sec 5.5 of [18]):

$$\min_{p \in \Delta, \epsilon \in [\underline{\epsilon}, \bar{\epsilon}]} \max_{\mu \in [0, \bar{\mu}]} \mathcal{L}(p, \epsilon, \mu) = \epsilon + \mu \left(\sum_{C \subseteq I} \ell_c(p, \epsilon) - \gamma^2 \right). \quad (10)$$

We can bound both ϵ and μ which ensures the function values and gradients are bounded as well. Let $v_{\max} = \max_{C \subseteq I} v(C)$. Then every coalitional constraint is trivially satisfied if $\epsilon \geq v_{\max}$, while the constraint associated with the grand coalition can not be satisfied if $\epsilon < 0$. Therefore, we can bound $\epsilon \in [\underline{\epsilon}, \bar{\epsilon}] = [0, v_{\max}]$. For μ , if only one constraint is violated, then we want μ to be large enough to force an increase in ϵ . Therefore, for any single violated coalitional constraint associated with C , we want $\nabla_\epsilon \mathcal{L} = 1 - \mu(d_c/|C|) < 1 - \mu(\gamma/|C|)$ to be strictly less than zero. This implies that if μ is at least $|C|/\gamma$, then ϵ will increase in response to any violated constraint. Hence, we set $\bar{\mu} = n/\gamma$ as an upper bound.

We observe that the Lagrangian formulation is convex in the primal variables (p, ϵ) and concave in the dual variable μ , hence equation (10) is typically referred to as a convex-concave saddle-point problem which can be equivalently formulated as a monotone variational inequality problem [38], for which stochastic algorithms exist including extra gradient [51] and Stochastic Mirror Prox [46]. Algorithm 4 provides pseudocode for the process. The key step is the Update function (Algorithm 3) which requires a Prox_x operator and a monotone map operator F .⁵ In variational inequality formulations $VI(F, \mathcal{X})$, the problem is to find $x^* \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $\langle F(x^*), x - x^* \rangle \geq 0$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$, and the map $F : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n+2}$ is typically written as a single vector valued map containing the ‘‘descent’’ directions of all variables. For our setting, we can define F as follows:

$$F(x) = \begin{bmatrix} \nabla_p \mathcal{L} \\ \nabla_\epsilon \mathcal{L} \\ -\nabla_\mu \mathcal{L} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -\mu \left(\sum_{C \subseteq I} \frac{d_c}{|C|} c \right) \\ 1 - \mu \left(\sum_{C \subseteq I} \frac{d_c}{|C|} \right) \\ - \left(\sum_{C \subseteq I} \ell_c(p, \epsilon) - \gamma^2 \right) \end{bmatrix} \quad (11)$$

where $x = [p, \epsilon, \mu] \in \mathcal{X} = \Delta \times [\underline{\epsilon}, \bar{\epsilon}] \times [0, \bar{\mu}]$. Observe that we can use sampling of minibatches of coalitions to Monte Carlo estimate the sums in $F(x)$, e.g., $\sum_{C \subseteq I} \ell_c(p, \epsilon) = \frac{2^n}{B} \mathbb{E}_{C_B \sim I} [\sum_{C \in C_B} \ell_c(p, \epsilon)]$.

LEMMA 1. *The map F in equation (11) is monotone, i.e., $\langle F(x), x - x' \rangle \geq 0$ over all $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$.*

The proof of Lemma 1 can be found in the Appendix.

THEOREM 4. *Let $v : 2^I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a characteristic function. Algorithm 4 reduces the duality gap $\max_{\mu'} \mathcal{L}(p, \epsilon, \mu') - \min_{p', \epsilon'} \mathcal{L}(p', \epsilon', \mu)$ at a rate of $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{T})$.*

PROOF. We can appeal directly to convergence rates of mirror prox algorithms for monotone variational inequalities [46] given we have already argued above that the norm of the map F and its variance are both finite and the map F is monotone (Lemma 1). \square

In experiments, we use a tailored Prox operator, specifically,

$$\text{Prox}_x(\eta F(y)) = \begin{bmatrix} \text{softmax}(\log(p) - \eta F_p(y)), \\ \text{clip}(\epsilon - \eta F_\epsilon(y), \underline{\epsilon}, \bar{\epsilon}), \\ \text{clip}(\mu - \eta F_\mu(y), 0, \bar{\mu}) \end{bmatrix} \quad (12)$$

⁵See [58] for proximal point approaches to saddle point problems.

Algorithm 3 Update

Input: Initial iterate x , map evaluation iterate y , batch size B , step size η , Prox operator
 Sample batch C_B containing B coalitions
 Compute $F(y)$ using batch of coalitions
 $x' \leftarrow \text{Prox}_x(\eta F(y))$
Output: x'

Algorithm 4 Least-Core via Mirror Prox (Core Lagrangian)

Input: Number of iterations T , batch size B , step size schedule η_t
 $p_0 = \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{1}_n$
 $\epsilon_0 = \bar{\epsilon}$
 $\mu_0 = \bar{\mu}$
 $x_0 = [p_0, \epsilon_0, \mu_0]$
for $t = 1 \leq T$ **do**
 $x' \leftarrow \text{Update}(x_{t-1}, x_{t-1}, B, \eta)$
 $x_t \leftarrow \text{Update}(x_{t-1}, x', B, \eta)$
end for
 Compute weighted average of imputations: $p^* = \frac{\eta_t p_t}{\sum_{t'} \eta_{t'}}$.
Output: p^*

where $F_z(y)$ retrieves the part of the vector output $F(y)$ corresponding to the variable y and $\text{softmax}(s) = [\frac{e^{s_1}}{\sum_j e^{s_j}}, \dots, \frac{e^{s_n}}{\sum_j e^{s_j}}]$.

Instructions for accelerating our proposed algorithms on GPUs/T- PUs are in Appendix A.2. Hyperparameters including, e.g., learning rate schedules, used in experiments are found in Appendix A.3.

4 EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS

We tested our algorithm, Core Lagrangian (CL) (Alg. 4), on a range of cooperative games and report our findings here. In our first set of experiments we compared the performance of CL to that of a recent state-of-the-art algorithm for approximating the least-core which relies on solving the LP using sampled coalitions [78] (Section 4.1). We then use our algorithm as a tool to study the stability properties of a number of prominent cooperative-game classes, illustrating the benefits of having algorithms for approximating the core for large games (Section 4.2). Finally, we examine applications of our algorithms for explainable AI (XAI) purposes (Section 5).

4.1 Timing Sampled LPs vs. Core Lagrangian

To test how efficient CL is in practice, we evaluate its performance across very large ($n = 100$) instances of weighted voting games.

DEFINITION 4. ([21, Definition 4.1]) *A weighted voting game G is a tuple (I, \mathbf{w}, q) where $I = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ is a set of agents, $\mathbf{w} = (w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a vector of weights (one per player), and $q \in \mathbb{R}$ is a quota. The characteristic function is*

$$v(C) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \sum_{c \in C} w_c \geq q; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Weighted voting games are well studied in the literature (e.g., [3, 34, 66, 69, 74, 80]) and can model real-world scenarios such as the European Union voting system [17, 64], or multiagent resource allocation problems where an agent’s weight correspond to resources

available for that agent, and the threshold is the total amount of pooled resources required to accomplish some task of interest.

In our experiments, each agent i has a weight $w_i \in \{1, 2, \dots, 100\}$ drawn uniformly at random and we set the quota $q = \xi n \mathbb{E}[w_i]$, where ξ is the proportional threshold (fraction of the expected total weight). We use proportional thresholds ξ sampled uniformly at random in the range $[0.1, 0.9]$. There are 2^{100} coalitions and thus 2^{100} constraints in the LP formulation of the least core (Constraint 2), so exactly solving for the least-core is computationally infeasible.

We compared our method to Yan and Procaccia’s recent algorithm for approximating the least core [78]. Their algorithm samples a subset of coalitions and returns the LP solution based on constraints built only from the sampled subset. With high probability, this method is guaranteed to reduce the approximation error as the number of coalitions sampled increases [78, Theorem 1].

It is difficult to compare iterations of CL to the number of sampled coalitions used in LP; instead, we chose a number of sampled coalitions k and recorded the wall clock time taken by the LP method for each value of k , say t_k seconds. Then, we let CL run for t_k seconds and retrieved the solution after that amount of elapsed time. The LP method used CVXPY [31] while our CL code used JAX and optax [4]. For each t_k , both methods returned an imputation, p_{LP} and p_{CL} , respectively. For each imputation we computed its respective (average) ϵ value. Due to the size of the game the error of the solution cannot be computed exactly, so we approximated the value of ϵ by sampling a set of 50,000 coalitions, \hat{C} , and computing $\hat{\epsilon}(p, \hat{C}) = \max_{c \in \hat{C}} (v(c) - p^\top c)$. Figure 2 summarizes our findings. In particular, we observed a significant improvement in the core approximation when using our method (CL) as opposed to the LP-based method. We did observe, however, that the threshold affects the degree to which CL outperforms the LP-based method. In particular, when the threshold was close to 50% of the total expected weight, the LP-based method would sometimes outperform CL.

4.2 Analyzing Stability in Compact Game Representations

After validating that our algorithm can effectively solve large cooperative games, showing improvements over a strong baseline, we further illustrate its value by making a rigorous study across prominent classes of cooperative games to better understand how different game-features affect stability.

4.2.1 Weighted Voting Games. In our first set of experiments we studied how stability was impacted by different parameterizations of weighted voting games, defined in Section 4.1. Since we were running multiple experiments, we set the number of agents to be $n = 15$, but drew agents’ weights from different distributions and varied the proportional quota, ξ . Figure 1 presents our results. We sample 10,000 games for each parameter configuration, and examine the average least-core value in these games. We first note that regions that have a low least-core value (blue) are stable or very close to being stable, whereas high ϵ -core indicate regions of instability. Second, we observe that the threshold greatly affected the stability of an instance. If the threshold was low, many coalitions form and achieve the maximum coalitional value of 1. If the threshold was very high, in expectation the only successful coalition was the grand coalition, reducing the likelihood of blocking coalitions.




Figure 2: Approximate ϵ of the linear program (LP) versus the core Lagrangian (CL) method as a function of computation time (seconds). The x -axis corresponds to wall-clock time taken by both algorithms run side-by-side given $k \in \{500, 1000, 2000, 4000, 8000, 16000\}$ sampled coalitions for the LP method, t_k . A better core approximation quality is reflected in having a lower ϵ for the same runtime. The y -axis represents the approximate ϵ of the least-core solution found, $\hat{\epsilon}(p_{LP}, \hat{C})$ and $\hat{\epsilon}(p_{CL}, \hat{C})$, computed over the same set of 50,000 coalitions, \hat{C} . Each data point $(t_k, \hat{\epsilon}(p_x, \hat{C}))$ represents an average over the same set of 2,500 random weighted voting games with shading indicating standard error of the mean.

In Figure 1(a) we present results where the agents’ weights were generated by a Gaussian distribution with $\mu = 1.0$ and $\sigma \in [0.01, 0.3]$. We observe that for a fixed quota, high weight-variance leads to less stable games. Figure 1(b) presents results when agents’ weights were drawn from an exponential distribution with $\lambda \in [0.25, 2.50]$. We observe that as λ increases we find less stable games. We hypothesize that since agent weights are more concentrated around low values, possible successful coalitions often share agents, opening up the possibility of the formation of blocking coalitions. Finally, in Figure 1(c) we present results where we used a Beta distribution with parameters (α, β) . We notice a difference in stability of games when the parameters are either less than 1.0 or greater than 1.0. If both α and β are high, games are less stable. However, there is a region of stability when $\alpha > 1.0$ and $\beta < 1.0$




Figure 1: (a)-(c) Heatmaps illustrating the impact of parameter axes on the least-core value (in color) in three weighted voting games. (d)-(e) Mean least-core value for Erdős-Rényi and Newman Watts Strogatz when sweeping over two hyperparameters. Constant hyperparameters are shown in parenthesis.

4.2.2 Graph Games. In many cooperative games, relationships between agents are modelled via a graph $G = \langle V, E \rangle$ (e.g., [7, 8, 19, 27, 28, 61, 65, 67]). In induced subgraph games [28], the agents are represented by vertices of the graph and the edge weight, $w(e)$ for $e = (i, j)$, indicates the value that agents i and j accrue from being in the same coalition. An absence of an edge implies there is no interaction between a pair of agents and thus, no loss or benefit from being in the same coalition. Given graph G , the characteristic function for the induced cooperative game is $v(C) = \sum_{e \in \{(i,j) \in E | i,j \in C\}} w(e)$.

We conduct an empirical study to better understand how the underlying graph structure influences the stability of the game. To this end, we select a collection of well-known parameterized random graph models, each with different properties, and generate 80 cooperative graph games for each parameterization, measuring their stability by computing their least-core values via our algorithm CL. We set $n = 32$, and generate edge weights with a Gaussian distribution with variance $\sigma = 1.0$ (unless specified otherwise) and positive mean μ chosen such that 60% of edge weights are positive in expectation.⁶ All graphs were generated using the NetworkX library [41]. We present results on two graph-classes, Erdős-Rényi [37] and Newman Watts Strogatz [62], and discuss four additional models in Appendix C.

In the Erdős-Rényi graph model there is a single parameter p , which indicates the probability that for any pair of vertices, x, y , there is an edge connecting x and y . In our experiments we varied p from 0.0 to 1.0, and varied the variance σ of the weight distribution from 1.0 to 3.0. Our results are shown in Figure 1d. We observe that the stability of the games generated depends on both p and σ . In particular, games with high weight variance for edge weights, and high uncertainty as to whether an edge would form between any pair of vertices (i.e., for $p \in [0.4, 0.7]$) are less stable.

The Newman Watts Strogatz model generates graphs with the small-world property and consists of two parameters. An instance of a graph is initialized as a ring and connected with its $\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor$ nearest neighbours. Additional edges in the graph are added with probability p . Figure 1e presents our results as we varied k from 4 to 24, and $p \in [0.0, 1.0]$. The variance of the edge-weight distribution was fixed at $\sigma = 1.0$. In particular we observe that both parameters p and k positively correlate with stability in these graphs.

⁶If graph games have only positive edge weights, then the core is non-empty, i.e. the least-core value is 0.0 [28].

More generally, these results (along with further results in Appendix C) show the interplay between the parameters of random-graph generators and the stability of the induced cooperative game. We believe that further research in this area is warranted, but also emphasize that such empirical analysis can only be carried out when using algorithms for tractably solving cooperative games at scale, such as the algorithms we have proposed.

5 EXPLAINABLE AI

Cooperative game theory has played an important role in the development of explainable AI (XAI) through the application of the Shapley value to feature-attribution and data-valuation problems [1, 2, 23, 54]. However researchers have also identified disadvantages of Shapley-based analysis, such as generating counter-intuitive explanations in various cases [72]. A recent paper argued that the core may provide an alternative to the Shapley value for XAI applications. In this section we explore this idea, applying our algorithm, CL, for computing the least-core on three different real-world datasets: Boston Housing dataset [42] (price regression), Diabetes dataset [33] (classification) and the Wisconsin Breast Cancer dataset [77] (classification). Our goal is to better understand how the Shapley value and the core are similar or different in their relative assessment of the impact of different features or data points have on the quality of trained models, specifically, scikit-learn’s default linear or logistic regression models [63].

5.1 Global Explainability

In the global explainability problem, a full dataset is used to determine which features have high impact on the quality of the trained model. We formulate this as a cooperative game by defining a coalition, C , to be a subset of features and $v(C)$ to be the quality of the model trained only on features in C . Quality may be measured as the accuracy in classification tasks, or as the coefficient of determination R^2 for regression tasks. Computing the Shapley value or the least-core for this game returns individual values, one per each feature, which can be interpreted as a measure of feature-importance.

Figure 3 presents a scatter plot showing the correlation between the feature-importance measures returned by applying the Shapley value and those produced by the least core (using our algorithm). Every point represents a single feature, with the x -axis reflecting its importance according to the Shapley value and the y -axis reflecting its importance according to the least core. The two importance measures are correlated, but reflect a different order of feature importance. Interestingly, the correlation is high when there are a few dominant features (Figures 3a,3b), but not as strong in the case where the predictions are driven by many features where none of the features is dominant (Figure 3c).

5.2 Local Explainability

In the local explainability problem, the focus is on the prediction a trained model makes on an individual instance. It seeks to determine how the values of individual features increase or decrease the model’s prediction for some instance. We define a cooperative game where a coalition, C , is a set of features and the characteristic function is the model’s prediction on a new instance, created by

taking some original instance from the dataset, fixing the values of all features in C , and replacing the values of features not in C by randomly sampling other instances.⁷ Given a dataset containing d instances, such an analysis results in f feature importance measures per each instance, resulting in $d \cdot f$ feature-importance measures, illustrating the importance of having scalable solutions for computing both the Shapley value and least-core.

Figure 3 presents results showing the correlation between Shapley feature-importance and least-core measures, over all the instances in each dataset. We present the data using contour plots due to the sheer number of data-points. Similar to our findings for the global explainability problem, we observe positive correlation between least-core and Shapley value. Note that the least core returns non-negative payoffs, which explains the bend in the trend at the origin.

5.3 Data Valuation

In the data valuation problem, the importance of each *data point* in the training set is measured. This problem can be formulated as a cooperative game by defining a coalition, C , to be a set of data points, with characteristic function, $v(C)$, being the quality of the model trained only on data points in C . The core (or least core) is a particularly compelling solution for the data valuation problem as imputations in the core can be interpreted as prices that must be paid to data providers so as to ensure the data is available (e.g., in the same way that core-pricing is used in package-auctions [25, 26]).

We conducted a series of data-valuation studies across different data sets. We used a similar methodology as Yan and Procaccia [78]: we imposed a budget of 50,000 calls to the characteristic function, limiting the number of permutations sampled for the Shapley value approximation and iterations for our least-core algorithm, CL. We then sorted the data by importance according to the Shapley value and least-core, and retrained the models by removing the most important data in blocks of 5% at a time.

Results are shown in Figure 4. In particular, these show data points deemed most important by the least-core are more critical to model performance than those selected according to Shapley value. These findings are consistent with previous literature [78]. However, we also applied this process to other data sets including an evaluation problem for large language models (LLMs), presented in Appendix D.2. There, the results are more nuanced in that there exist scenarios where a Shapley value approach is better at identifying key data points. These results open up new research questions around characterizations as to when Shapley-based or core-based data valuation is more appropriate.

5.3.1 Elo Ratings on Chatbot Arena data set. We now describe another data valuation experiment that differs from the others in that it is not a traditional regression nor classification task. The Chatbot Arena data set is composed of humans rating the quality of answers to questions to 20 different large language models (LLMs) [79]. Each data point consists of a question and two answers: each answer generated by two different LLMs. The human then picks which answer is the best one and this is recorded as a win for the LLM that

⁷In our experiments with the least core, we use the version where non-coalition features are taken from a random instance selected from the 10% of the instances with the lowest prediction.




Figure 3: Correlation of Shapley and Core importance measures of features at both global dataset and individual instance levels.




Figure 4: Data Valuation on the Boston Housing, Diabetes, and Chat Bot Arena. Error bars correspond to 95% confidence intervals (1000 repeats).

generated the better response and a loss for the one that generated the worse response. In total, the data set consists of 33000 data points.

The supervised learning problem is to learn an Elo rating [36] for each LLM that can be ranked to compare the “skill level” (in this context: propensity to generate the better answer) of each LLM. Elo is classic rating system that was proposed for ranking chess engines; each LLM is assigned a rating, say r_i and r_j , that models the probability of LLM i beating LLM j as a logistic function of their ratings, $\Pr(i \text{ beats } j) = \sigma((r_i - r_j)/400) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-(r_j - r_i)/400}}$, where σ is the sigmoid function $\sigma(x) = (1 + e^{-x})^{-1}$. The ratings can be learned using online updates, or more precisely given a batch of data using logistic regression or minorization-maximization (MM) algorithms [44].

We apply data valuation in a similar way as before. For each experiment, we first sample a training set and test set pair $(\mathcal{D}_R, \mathcal{D}_T)$, with $|\mathcal{D}_R| = 1000$ and $|\mathcal{D}_T| = 10000$. A coalition is then a subset of data points from this training set, $c \subseteq \mathcal{D}_R$, leading to a 1000-player coalitional game. As in the other settings, the characteristic function is a measure of how well the model learned on c performs on the test set \mathcal{D}_T . For each coalition, c , we run the MM method [44] for 20000 iterations to learn Elo ratings of the batch of data $c \subseteq \mathcal{D}_R$. Given the learned ratings \vec{r}_c , we compute the average cross entropy loss over the test set, $L_{CE}(\vec{r}_c, \mathcal{D}_T)$. Finally, we define the characteristic function for as $v(c) = 2 - L_{CE}(\vec{r}_c, \mathcal{D}_T)$. As before we set a budget of 50000 calls to the characteristic function for both Shapley and the least core computations. Figure 4c shows that in contrast to the other data sets and experiments in [78], the Shapley values attribute importances that are more critical to model performance than the least core.

6 CONCLUSION

We examined the core, a distribution of payoff over members in a coalition that is a central solution concept in cooperative game theory. We proposed a scalable solver for the least core that can handle the exponential number of possible coalitions that define the core constraints. We provided convergence rates and guarantees for this solver and showed empirically that it is faster than previous core solvers [78].

Our empirical analysis shows several applications of our core solver, including studying stability of prominent forms of coalitional games and explainable AI (XAI) problems. For XAI, we highlighted that analysis based on the core differs from the current de-facto standard based on the Shapley value. Further, for the purpose of data evaluation, our results indeed show that in certain cases the core outperforms the Shapley value as a way of selecting the data instances for training machine learning models.

Several problems remain open for future research. First, could one derive even faster algorithms for approximating the core (in terms of the worst-case performance, or in terms of empirical performance on problems of interest)? Second, could better approximation algorithms for the core be tailored to specific classes of games? Third, could one extend our analysis to other known forms of cooperative games to determine the key features that affect coalitional stability in them? Fourth, our analysis has identified ways of selecting data for training models. Could one leverage such results to speed up the training or runtime performance of machine learning models? Finally, when is it better to use the core and when is it better to use the Shapley value for feature importance measurements or data selection?

REFERENCES

- [1] Liat Antwarg, Ronnie Mindlin Miller, Bracha Shapira, and Lior Rokach. 2019. Explaining anomalies detected by autoencoders using SHAP. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.02407* (2019).
- [2] Alejandro Barredo Arrieta, Natalia Díaz-Rodríguez, Javier Del Ser, Adrien Benetot, Siham Tabik, Alberto Barbado, Salvador García, Sergio Gil-López, Daniel Molina, Richard Benjamins, et al. 2020. Explainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI): Concepts, taxonomies, opportunities and challenges toward responsible AI. *Information Fusion* 58 (2020), 82–115.
- [3] Haris Aziz, Yoram Bachrach, Edith Elkind, and Mike Paterson. 2011. False-name manipulations in weighted voting games. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research* 40 (2011), 57–93.
- [4] Igor Babuschkin, Kate Baumli, Alison Bell, Surya Bhupatiraju, Jake Bruce, Peter Buchlovsky, David Budden, Trevor Cai, Aidan Clark, Ivo Danihelka, Antoine Dedieu, Claudio Fantacci, Jonathan Godwin, Chris Jones, Ross Hemsley, Tom Hennigan, Matteo Hessel, Shaobo Hou, Steven Kapturovski, Thomas Keck, Iurii Kemaev, Michael King, Markus Kunesch, Lena Martens, Hamza Merzic, Vladimir Mikulik, Tamara Norman, George Papamakarios, John Quan, Roman Ring, Francisco Ruiz, Alvaro Sanchez, Laurent Sartran, Rosalia Schneider, Eren Sezener, Stephen Spencer, Srivatsan Srinivasan, Miloš Stanojević, Wojciech Stokowiec, Luyu Wang, Guangyao Zhou, and Fabio Viola. 2020. *The DeepMind JAX Ecosystem*. <http://github.com/deepmind>
- [5] Yoram Bachrach. 2011. The least-core of threshold network flow games. In *International Symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science*. Springer, 36–47.
- [6] Yoram Bachrach, Evangelos Markakis, Ezra Resnick, Ariel D Procaccia, Jeffrey S Rosenschein, and Amin Saberi. 2010. Approximating power indices: Theoretical and empirical analysis. *Autonomous Agents and Multi-Agent Systems* 20 (2010), 105–122.
- [7] Yoram Bachrach and Ely Porat. 2010. Path disruption games. In *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems: volume 1-Volume 1*. 1123–1130.
- [8] Yoram Bachrach and Jeffrey S Rosenschein. 2007. Computing the Banzhaf power index in network flow games. In *Proceedings of the 6th International Joint Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems*. 1–7.
- [9] Y. Bachrach and J. S. Rosenschein. 2008. Coalitional Skills Games. In *Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multi-Agent Systems (AAMAS)*. 1023–1030.
- [10] Catalin Badea and David Seifert. 2016. Ritt operators and convergence in the method of alternating projections. *Journal of Approximation Theory* 205 (2016), 133–148.
- [11] Maria-Florina Balcan, Ariel Procaccia, and Yair Zick. 2015. Learning Cooperative Games. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI 2015)*. 475–481.
- [12] U.; Balkanski, E.; Syed and S. Vassilvitskii. 2017. Statistical Cost Sharing. In *Proceedings of the 31st Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*. 6221–6230.
- [13] Alejandro Barredo Arrieta, Natalia Díaz-Rodríguez, Javier Del Ser, Adrien Benetot, Siham Tabik, Alberto Barbado, Salvador García, Sergio Gil-Lopez, Daniel Molina, Richard Benjamins, Raja Chatila, and Francisco Herrera. 2020. Explainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI): Concepts, taxonomies, opportunities and challenges toward responsible AI. *Information Fusion* 58 (2020), 82–115. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.inffus.2019.12.012>
- [14] Heinz H Bauschke and Jonathan M Borwein. 1996. On projection algorithms for solving convex feasibility problems. *SIAM Rev.* 38, 3 (1996), 367–426.
- [15] Umang Bhatt, Alice Xiang, Shubham Sharma, Ankur Taly Adrian Weller, Yunhan Jia, Joydeep Ghosh, Ruchir Puri, José M. F. Moura, and Peter Eckersley. 2020. Explainable Machine Learning in Deployment. In *Proceedings of the ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*.
- [16] JM Bilbao, JR Fernandez, A Jiménez Losada, and JJ Lopez. 2000. Generating functions for computing power indices efficiently. *Top* 8, 2 (2000), 191–213.
- [17] JM Bilbao, N Jiminéz, and JJ López. 2002. Voting power in the European Union enlargement. *European Journal of Operations Research* 143 (2002), 181–196.
- [18] Stephen P Boyd and Lieven Vandenberghe. 2004. *Convex optimization*. Cambridge university press.
- [19] Simina Branzei and Kate Larson. 2011. Social Distance Games. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Second International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI 2011)*.
- [20] Javier Castro, Daniel Gómez, and Juan Tejada. 2009. Polynomial calculation of the Shapley value based on sampling. *Computers & Operations Research* 36, 5 (2009), 1726–1730.
- [21] Georgios Chalkiadakis, Edith Elkind, and Michael Wooldridge. 2012. *Computational Aspects of Cooperative Game Theory*. Morgan & Claypool Publishers.
- [22] George Dantzig. 1963. *Linear programming and extensions*. Princeton University Press.
- [23] Anupam Datta, Shayak Sen, and Yair Zick. 2016. Algorithmic transparency via quantitative input influence: Theory and experiments with learning systems. In *2016 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. IEEE, 598–617.
- [24] Damek Davis and Dmitriy Drusvyatskiy. 2018. Stochastic subgradient method converges at the rate $O(k^{-1/4})$ on weakly convex functions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.02988* (2018).
- [25] Robert Day and Paul Milgrom. 2008. Core-selecting package auctions. *International Journal of Game Theory* 36 (2008), 393–407.
- [26] Robert W. Day and Peter Cramton. 2012. Quadratic Core-Selecting Payment Rules for Combinatorial Auctions. *Operations Research* 60, 3 (2012), 588–603.
- [27] Gabrielle Demange. 2004. On Group Stability in Hierarchies and Networks. *Journal of Political Economy* 112, 4 (2004), 754–778.
- [28] Xiaotie Deng and Christos H. Papadimitriou. 1994. On the complexity of cooperative solution concepts. *Math. Oper. Res.* 19, 2 (1994), 257–266.
- [29] G. d’Eon and K. Larson. 2020. Testing Axioms Against Human Reward Divisions in Cooperative Games. In *Proceedings of the Nineteenth International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multi-Agent Systems (AAMAS)*.
- [30] Frank Deutsch. 1995. Dykstra’s cyclic projections algorithm: the rate of convergence. *Approximation Theory, Wavelets and Applications* (1995), 87–94.
- [31] Steven Diamond and Stephen Boyd. 2016. CVXPY: A Python-embedded modeling language for convex optimization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 17, 83 (2016), 1–5.
- [32] Pradeep Dubey. 1982. The Shapley value as aircraft landing fees—revisited. *Management Science* 28, 8 (1982), 869–874.
- [33] Bradley Efron, Trevor Hastie, Iain Johnstone, and Robert Tibshirani. 2004. Least angle regression. (2004).
- [34] Edith Elkind, Leslie Ann Goldberg, Paul W Goldberg, and Michael Wooldridge. 2009. On the computational complexity of weighted voting games. *Annals of Mathematics and Artificial Intelligence* 56 (2009), 109–131.
- [35] E. Elkind and D. Pasechnik. 2009. Computing the nucleolus of weighted voting games. In *Proceedings of the Nineteenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics Philadelphia, PA, USA, 327–335.
- [36] Arpad E. Elo. 1978. *The Ratings of Chess Players, Past and Present* (2nd ed.). Arco Publishing, Inc.
- [37] László Erdős, Antti Knowles, Horng-Tzer Yau, and Jun Yin. 2013. Spectral statistics of Erdős–Rényi graphs I: Local semicircle law. (2013).
- [38] Francisco Facchinei and Jong-Shi Pang. 2003. *Finite-Dimensional Variational Inequalities and Complementarity Problems*. Springer.
- [39] Shaheen S Fatima, Michael Wooldridge, and Nicholas R Jennings. 2008. A linear approximation method for the Shapley value. *Artificial Intelligence* 172, 14 (2008), 1673–1699.
- [40] Donald Bruce Gillies. 1953. *Some theorems on n-person games*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Princeton University.
- [41] Aric A. Hagberg, Daniel A. Schult, and Pieter J. Swart. 2008. Exploring Network Structure, Dynamics, and Function using NetworkX. In *Proceedings of the 7th Python in Science Conference*, Gaël Varoquaux, Travis Vaught, and Jarrod Millman (Eds.). Pasadena, CA USA, 11 – 15.
- [42] David Harrison Jr and Daniel L Rubinfeld. 1978. Hedonic housing prices and the demand for clean air. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 5, 1 (1978), 81–102.
- [43] Petter Holme and Beom Jun Kim. 2002. Growing scale-free networks with tunable clustering. *Phys. Rev. E* 65 (Jan 2002), 026107. Issue 2. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.65.026107>
- [44] David R. Hunter. 2004. MM Algorithms for Generalized Bradley-Terry Models. *The Annals of Statistics* 32, 1 (2004), 384–406.
- [45] Samuel Ieong and Yoav Shoham. 2005. Marginal contribution nets: a compact representation scheme for coalitional games. In *Proceedings of the 6th ACM Conference on Electronic Commerce*. 193–202.
- [46] Anatoli Juditsky, Arkadi Nemirovski, and Claire Tauvel. 2011. Solving variational inequalities with stochastic mirror-prox algorithm. *Stochastic Systems* 1, 1 (2011), 17–58.
- [47] Narendra Karmarkar. 1984. A new polynomial-time algorithm for linear programming. In *Proceedings of the Sixteenth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*. 302–311.
- [48] Walter Kern and Daniël Paulusma. 2003. Matching games: the least core and the nucleolus. *Mathematics of Operations Research* 28, 2 (2003), 294–308.
- [49] Alf Kimms and Igor Kozeletskyi. 2016. Core-based cost allocation in the cooperative traveling salesman problem. *European Journal of Operational Research* 248, 3 (2016), 910–916.
- [50] Diederik P Kingma and Jimmy Ba. 2014. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980* (2014).
- [51] Galina M Korpelevich. 1976. The extragradient method for finding saddle points and other problems. *Matecon* 12 (1976), 747–756.
- [52] I. E. Kumar, Venkatasubramanian, S., Scheidegger, and C. Friedler. 2020. Problems with Shapley-value-based explanations as feature importance measures. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*.
- [53] Stephen C Littlechild and GF Thompson. 1977. Aircraft landing fees: a game theory approach. *The Bell Journal of Economics* (1977), 186–204.

- [54] Scott M Lundberg and Su-In Lee. 2017. A unified approach to interpreting model predictions. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 30 (2017).
- [55] Sasan Maleki, Long Tran-Thanh, Greg Hines, Talal Rahwan, and Alex Rogers. 2013. Bounding the estimation error of sampling-based Shapley value approximation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1306.4265* (2013).
- [56] Rory Mitchell, Joshua Cooper, Eibe Frank, and Geoffrey Holmes. 2022. Sampling permutations for shapley value estimation. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research* 23, 1 (2022), 2082–2127.
- [57] Rory Mitchell, Joshua Cooper, Eibe Frank, and Geoffrey Holmes. 2022. Sampling Permutations for Shapley Value Estimation. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 23 (2022), 2082–2127.
- [58] Aryan Mokhtari, Asuman Ozdaglar, and Sarath Pattathil. 2020. A unified analysis of extra-gradient and optimistic gradient methods for saddle point problems: Proximal point approach. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*. PMLR, 1497–1507.
- [59] Dmitry Moor, Sven Seuken, Tobias Grubenmann, and Abraham Bernstein. 2016. Core-Selecting Payment Rules for Combinatorial Auctions with Uncertain Availability of Goods. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI-16)*.
- [60] Niema Moshiri. 2018. The dual-Barabási-Albert model. arXiv:1810.10538 [physics.soc-ph]
- [61] Roger B. Myerson. 1977. Graphs and Cooperation in Games. *Mathematics of Operations Research* 2, 3 (1977), 225–229.
- [62] M.E.J. Newman and D.J. Watts. 1999. Renormalization group analysis of the small-world network model. *Physics Letters A* 263, 4 (1999), 341–346. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0375-9601\(99\)00757-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0375-9601(99)00757-4)
- [63] F. Pedregosa, G. Varoquaux, A. Gramfort, V. Michel, B. Thirion, O. Grisel, M. Blondel, P. Prettenhofer, R. Weiss, V. Dubourg, J. Vanderplas, A. Passos, D. Cournapeau, M. Brucher, M. Perrot, and E. Duchesnay. 2011. Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in Python. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 12 (2011), 2825–2830.
- [64] Tapio Raunio and Matti Wiberg. 1998. Winners and Losers in the Council: Voting Power Consequences of EU Enlargements. *Journal of Common Market Studies (JCMS)* 38 (1998), 549–562. Issue 4.
- [65] Ezra Resnick, Yoram Bachrach, Reshef Meir, and Jeffrey S Rosenschein. 2009. The cost of stability in network flow games. In *Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science 2009: 34th International Symposium, MFCS 2009, Novy Smokovec, High Tatras, Slovakia, August 24-28, 2009. Proceedings 34*. Springer, 636–650.
- [66] Anja Rey and Jörg Rothe. 2010. Complexity of merging and splitting for the probabilistic Banzhaf power index in weighted voting games. In *ECAI 2010*. IOS Press, 1021–1022.
- [67] Anja Rey and Jörg Rothe. 2011. Bribery in path-disruption games. In *International Conference on Algorithmic Decision Theory*. Springer, 247–261.
- [68] Dov Samet and Eitan Zemel. 1984. On the core and dual set of linear programming games. *Mathematics of Operations Research* 9, 2 (1984), 309–316.
- [69] Abigail See, Yoram Bachrach, and Pushmeet Kohli. 2014. The cost of principles: analyzing power in compatibility weighted voting games. In *Proceedings of the 2014 International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multi-Agent Systems*. Citeseer, 37–44.
- [70] Lloyd S. Shapley. 1951. Notes on the n-Person Game – II: The Value of an n-Person Game. RAND Corporation.
- [71] Lloyd S Shapley and Martin Shubik. 1954. A method for evaluating the distribution of power in a committee system. *American Political Science Review* 48, 3 (1954), 787–792.
- [72] Mukund Sundararajan and Amir Najmi. 2020. The many Shapley values for model explanation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 9269–9278.
- [73] Nikola Tarashev, Kostas Tsatsaronis, and Claudio Borio. 2016. Risk attribution using the Shapley value: Methodology and policy applications. *Review of Finance* 20, 3 (2016), 1189–1213.
- [74] Alan Taylor and William Zwicker. 1992. A characterization of weighted voting. *Proceedings of the American mathematical society* 115, 4 (1992), 1089–1094.
- [75] Hilde J.P. Weerts, Werner van Ipenburg, and Mykola Pechenizkiy. 2019. A Human-Grounded Evaluation of SHAP for Alert Processing. In *Proceedings of the KDD Workshop on Explainable AI 2019 (KDD-XAI)*.
- [76] M. A. Williams. 1988. An empirical test of cooperative game solution concepts. *Behavioral Science* 33, 3 (1988), 224–237.
- [77] William Wolberg, Olvi Mangasarian, Nick Street, and W. Street. 1995. Breast Cancer Wisconsin (Diagnostic). UCI Machine Learning Repository. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24432/C5DW2B>.
- [78] Tom Yan and Ariel D. Procaccia. 2021. If You Like Shapley Then You’ll Love the Core. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* 35, 6 (May 2021), 5751–5759. <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v35i6.16721>
- [79] Lianmin Zheng, Wei-Lin Chiang, Ying Sheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Zhanghao Wu, Yonghao Zhuang, Zi Lin, Zhuohan Li, Dacheng Li, Eric. P Xing, Hao Zhang, Joseph E. Gonzalez, and Ion Stoica. 2023. Judging LLM-as-a-judge with MT-Bench and Chatbot Arena. arXiv:2306.05685 [cs.CL] See also <https://lmsys.org/blog/2023-05-03-arena/> and <https://huggingface.co/spaces/lmsys/chatbot-arena-leaderboard>. Accessed August 13th, 2023.
- [80] Michael Zuckerman, Piotr Faliszewski, Yoram Bachrach, and Edith Elkind. 2012. Manipulating the quota in weighted voting games. *Artificial Intelligence* 180 (2012), 1–19.

A ALGORITHMS

A.1 Proofs of Theoretical Results

We restate Theorem 2 and Lemma 1 and include their proofs.

THEOREM. *If $\ell_c(\epsilon, p) \leq \gamma^2$ for all c , then p is in the $(\epsilon + \sqrt{2n\gamma})$ -core.*

PROOF.

$$\ell_c(\epsilon, p) = \frac{1}{2|c|} (\max(0, v(C) - \epsilon - p^\top c))^2 \leq \gamma^2 \quad \forall c \in C \quad (13)$$

$$\implies \frac{1}{\sqrt{2|c|}} (v(C) - \epsilon - p^\top c) \leq \gamma \quad \forall c \in C \quad (14)$$

$$\implies v(C) - \epsilon - p^\top c \leq \sqrt{2n\gamma} \quad \forall c \in C \quad (15)$$

$$\implies v(C) - (\epsilon + \sqrt{2n\gamma}) - p^\top c \leq 0 \quad \forall c \in C. \quad (16)$$

□

LEMMA. *The map F in equation (11) is monotone, i.e., $\langle F(x) - F(x'), x - x' \rangle \geq 0$ over all $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$.*

PROOF. First, for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $x' \in \mathcal{X}$, we find that $F(x)^\top x'$

$$= \epsilon' + \mu \left(\sum_{c \in C} \frac{d_c}{|C|} (-c^\top p' - \epsilon') \right) - \mu' \left(\sum_{c \in C} \ell_c(p, \epsilon) - \gamma^2 \right) \quad (17)$$

$$= \epsilon' + \mu \left(\sum_{c \in C} \frac{d_c}{|C|} (d'_c - v(C)) \right) - \mu' \left(\sum_{c \in C} \ell_c(p, \epsilon) - \gamma^2 \right). \quad (18)$$

Therefore, $(F(x) - F(x'))^\top (x - x')$

$$= \epsilon + \mu \left(\sum_{c \in C} \frac{d_c}{|C|} (d_c - v(C)) \right) - \mu \left(\sum_{c \in C} \ell_c(p, \epsilon) - \gamma^2 \right) \quad (19)$$

$$- \epsilon - \mu' \left(\sum_{c \in C} \frac{d'_c}{|C|} (d'_c - v(C)) \right) + \mu' \left(\sum_{c \in C} \ell_c(p', \epsilon') - \gamma^2 \right) \quad (20)$$

$$- \epsilon' - \mu \left(\sum_{c \in C} \frac{d_c}{|C|} (d'_c - v(C)) \right) + \mu' \left(\sum_{c \in C} \ell_c(p, \epsilon) - \gamma^2 \right) \quad (21)$$

$$+ \epsilon' + \mu' \left(\sum_{c \in C} \frac{d'_c}{|C|} (d'_c - v(C)) \right) - \mu' \left(\sum_{c \in C} \ell_c(p', \epsilon') - \gamma^2 \right) \quad (22)$$

$$= \left(\sum_{c \in C} \frac{1}{|C|} [\mu d_c (d_c - v(C)) - \mu' d'_c (d'_c - v(C))] \right) \quad (23)$$

$$- \mu d_c (d'_c - v(C)) + \mu' d'_c (d'_c - v(C)) \quad (24)$$

$$- \left(\sum_{c \in C} (\mu' - \mu) (\ell_c(p', \epsilon') - \ell_c(p, \epsilon)) \right) \quad (25)$$

$$= \left(\sum_{c \in C} \frac{1}{|C|} (d'_c - d_c) (\mu' d'_c - \mu d_c) \right) \quad (26)$$

$$- \left(\sum_{c \in C} (\mu' - \mu) (\ell_c(p', \epsilon') - \ell_c(p, \epsilon)) \right) \quad (27)$$

$$= \left(\sum_{c \in C} \frac{1}{|C|} (d'_c - d_c) (\mu' d'_c - \mu d_c) \right) \quad (28)$$

$$- \left(\sum_{c \in C} \frac{1}{|C|} \frac{1}{2} (\mu' - \mu) (d_c'^2 - d_c^2) \right) \quad (29)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{c \in C} \frac{1}{|C|} (\mu + \mu') (d_c - d'_c)^2 \right) \geq 0 \quad (30)$$

confirming that F is indeed monotone. □

We further bound the following quantities as they may be of interest to others for further follow-up algorithmic development. We can bound the result in Lemma 1. First, recognize

$$(d_c - d'_c)^2 = \begin{cases} ((\epsilon + c^\top p) - (\epsilon' + c^\top p'))^2 & \text{if } d \geq 0 \text{ and } d' \geq 0 \\ (v(C) - \epsilon - c^\top p)^2 & \text{if } d \geq 0 \text{ and } d' < 0 \\ (v(C) - \epsilon' - c^\top p')^2 & \text{if } d < 0 \text{ and } d' \geq 0 \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases} \quad (31)$$

$$\leq ((\epsilon + c^\top p) - (\epsilon' + c^\top p'))^2 \quad (32)$$

$$+ \max \left\{ (v(C) - \epsilon - c^\top p)^2, (v(C) - \epsilon' - c^\top p')^2 \right\} \quad (33)$$

$$\leq ((\epsilon + \epsilon') + (c^\top p - c^\top p'))^2 + 4V(I)^2 \quad (34)$$

$$= \|x - x'\|_M^2 + 4V(I)^2 \quad (35)$$

where $M = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & c^\top & 0 \\ c & cc^\top & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \leq 2nI$. Therefore,

$$0 \leq (F(x) - F(x'))^\top (x - x') \quad (36)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{c \in C} \frac{1}{|C|} (\mu + \mu') (d' - d)^2 \right) \quad (37)$$

$$\leq \left(\sum_{c \in C} \frac{1}{|C|} \bar{\mu} (\|x - x'\|_M^2 + 4v(I)^2) \right). \quad (38)$$

We can also bound $\|F(x) - F(x')\|^2$. First, we can rewrite it as

$$= \left\| \mu' \left(\sum_{c \in C} \frac{d'_c}{C} c \right) - \mu \left(\sum_{c \in C} \frac{d_c}{C} c \right) \right\|^2 \quad (39)$$

$$+ \left(\mu' \left(\sum_{c \in C} \frac{d'_c}{C} \right) - \mu \left(\sum_{c \in C} \frac{d_c}{C} \right) \right)^2 \quad (40)$$

$$+ \left(\left(\sum_{c \in C} \ell_c(p', \epsilon') \right) - \left(\sum_{c \in C} \ell_c(p, \epsilon) \right) \right)^2 \quad (41)$$

$$= \left\| \sum_{c \in C} \frac{c}{C} (\mu' d' - \mu d) \right\|^2 \quad (42)$$

$$+ \left(\sum_{c \in C} \frac{1}{C} (\mu' d' - \mu d) \right)^2 \quad (43)$$

$$+ \left(\sum_{c \in C} \frac{1}{2C} (d'^2 - d^2) \right)^2 \quad (44)$$

and then upper bound it as

$$\leq \sum_{c \in C} \left\| \frac{1}{C} (\mu' d' - \mu d) \right\|^2 + \sum_{c \in C} \left(\frac{1}{C} (\mu' d' - \mu d) \right)^2 \quad (45)$$

$$\leq \sum_{c \in C} \left\| \frac{1}{C} (\mu' d' - \mu d) \right\|^2 + \sum_{c \in C} \left(\frac{1}{C} (\mu' d' - \mu d) \right)^2 \quad (46)$$

$$+ \sum_{c \in C} \left(\frac{1}{2C} (d'^2 - d^2) \right)^2 \quad (47)$$

$$\leq \sum_{c \in C} \frac{1}{C} (\mu' d' - \mu d)^2 + \sum_{c \in C} \left(\frac{1}{C} (\mu' d' - \mu d) \right)^2 \quad (48)$$

$$+ \sum_{c \in C} \left(\frac{1}{2C} (d'^2 - d^2) \right)^2 \quad (49)$$

$$\leq \sum_{c \in C} \frac{1}{C} \left(2(\mu' d' - \mu d)^2 + \frac{1}{4} (d'^2 - d^2)^2 \right) \quad (50)$$

$$\leq \sum_{c \in C} \frac{1}{C} \left(2(\mu' d' - \mu d)^2 + \frac{1}{4} (d' + d)^2 (d' - d)^2 \right). \quad (51)$$

A.2 Deployment with Accelerators

It is possible to accelerate Algorithm 4 on GPU/TPUs. The other algorithms we proposed can reuse these techniques as well. This is a key advantage of iterative, stochastic (Monte Carlo, minibatch) algorithms. The key step to parallelize is $d_c = \max(0, v(c) - \epsilon - p^T c)$ for a batch of constraints.

Let C be a $B \times n$ matrix representing a batch of B coalitions with a single coalition c represented on each row (we are abusing notation from earlier where C represents a single coalition). Each entry of C indicates whether player i is included in coalition c . Therefore, this matrix is sparse (and binary). Let d be a vector containing d_c for each coalition c . Let v be a vector containing the value of each coalition. Then in JAX [4], $d = \text{jax.nn.relu}(v - \epsilon - \text{jnp.dot}(C, p))$.

This is quite similar to the operation of processing the output of a single neural network layer followed by a ReLU nonlinearity. C plays the role of the typical weight matrix W . p plays the role of the typical input x to a neural network layer. The offset of the neural network layer is $v - \epsilon$. And jax.nn.relu is the nonlinearity.

We now describe how to use the resulting output d to compute the updates of Algorithm 4. The update in $F(x)$ (see equation (11)) can then be easily computed from d . Note $\ell(p, \epsilon) = d^T \oslash (2C \mathbf{1}_n)$ where $\mathbf{1}_n$ is the length- n ones vector. $F(x)$ is then used to construct the Update in the for loop of Algorithm 4.

When the batch size B is very large, the operation $\text{jnp.dot}(C, p)$ can take advantage of GPUs/TPUs to process this matrix-vector operation quickly. C is sparse, which can also speed up calculations using sparse matrix multiplication libraries.

Furthermore, if the batch size B is too large to fit C on a single device, the batches can be split up across devices, say $d^j = \text{jax.nn.relu}(v^j - \epsilon - \text{jnp.dot}(C^j, p))$. The update in $F(x)$ can be computed similarly to before on each device (giving us $F^j(x)$) and then aggregated across devices to produce the final result.

A.3 Algorithm Hyperparameters

We report the hyperparameters we used for Algorithm 4 below. For the runtime experiment in Figure 2, we used those reported in Table 1.

Learning Rate Schedule η_t	0.1 \rightarrow 0.01 over 1000 steps
Coalition Batch Size B	100
Lagrange Multiplier Initial Value μ_0	1000
Constraint Violation Threshold γ	0.001
Number of Iterations T	10,000

Table 1: Algorithm 4 Hyperparameters: Runtime Experiment. Alternatively, the linear schedule can be written as $\eta_t = \max(0.01, 0.1 \cdot (1 - \frac{t}{1000}) + 0.01(\frac{t}{1000}))$.

For the remaining experiments, we used a change of variables and replaced p with $\text{softmax}(s)$ where s , our new decision variable, is a vector of n real-valued logits. This then allowed us to use the more sophisticated update operator Adam [50]. Note that the JAX [4] autodiff library makes it trivial to compute $F_s = \nabla_s \mathcal{L}(p(s), \epsilon, \mu)$ after the change of variables. We used the hyperparameters reported in Table 2.

Learning Rate Schedule η_t	0.1
Coalition Batch Size B	1000
Lagrange Multiplier Initial Value μ_0	1000
Constraint Violation Threshold γ	0.01
Number of Iterations T	10,000

Table 2: Algorithm 4 Hyperparameters: Other Experiments

B SHAPLEY VALUE VERSUS THE CORE

The Shapley value is an intuitive solution concept for quantifying the expected marginal contribution of a player. The *marginal contribution* of agent i to a coalition C such that $i \notin C$ is the increase in utility the coalition C achieves when i joins it, defined as $m_i^C = v(C \cup \{i\}) - v(C)$. We can define a similar concept for *permutations* of agents. We denote the predecessors of i in the permutation π as $b(i, \pi)$, i.e. the agents appearing before i in the permutation π . We denote the set of all permutations over the agents as Π . The marginal contribution of player i in the permutation π is the increase in utility i provides when joining the team of agents appearing before them in the permutation, $m_i^\pi = v(b(i, \pi) \cup \{i\}) - v(b(i, \pi))$. The **Shapley value** of agent i is defined as their marginal contribution, averaged across all permutations:

$$\Phi_i(v) = \frac{1}{N!} \sum_{\pi \in \Pi} v(b(i, \pi) \cup \{i\}) - v(b(i, \pi)) \quad (52)$$

The Shapley value uniquely exhibits four axiomatic properties [21]: *efficiency*: $\sum_{i=1}^n \Phi_i(v) = v(I)$, *null player*: if i contributes nothing, then $\Phi_i(v) = 0$, *symmetry*: $\forall C \subseteq I - \{i, j\}, v(C \cup \{i\}) = v(C \cup \{j\}) \Rightarrow \Phi_i(v) = \Phi_j(v)$, and *additivity*: for two games v_1, v_2 , the Shapley value of the combined game $\Phi_i(v_1 + v_2) = \Phi_i(v_1) + \Phi_i(v_2)$. One advantage of the Shapley value is that it can also be computed using Monte Carlo sampling [6, 57]. The Shapley value has become widely-used as a means of quantifying the effects of individual features in XAI [54].

As discussed in the main paper, there are some computational and conceptual limitations of the Shapley value. Computationally,

there are some games where no polynomial-time algorithm can obtain sufficiently small confidence intervals [9] and others for which it cannot be computed using a uniform distribution [12]. For XAI applications, the Shapley value has been criticized for several reasons. Firstly, the Shapley value does not necessarily reflect what human end users really want to explain about models in deployment [15]. As such, it has been labeled “not a natural solution to the human-centric issues of explainability” [52]. Second, when features are correlated, it is not clear how Shapley values should attribute relative importance [52]. Third, the usefulness of the additivity axiom is questionable [78] and can be uninformative for non-additive models [52]. Finally, when humans aided with a model were evaluated on alert processing, there was no significant difference in task utility metrics when the Shapley values were provided versus not provided [75].

In contrast, the core focuses on the *stability* of the imputations. In particular, utility subdivisions discovered by the core can be interpreted as “economically plausible payments in a competitive market in the sense that every coalition should be compensated for its market value” [78]. Imputations outside the core would lead to some agents having incentive to form different coalitions for higher value and redistribute the extra payoff among themselves. In some contexts, approximations of the least core can attribute importance more reliably than Shapley value in XAI [78]. Outside of XAI, the core is used to select payment rules in combinatorial auctions due to problems with the commonly-used mechanisms [26, 59].

Lastly, there is evidence that the Shapley value has weaker empirical support than the core for predicting human payment divisions in behavioral studies [76]. In a more recent study, behavior of players deviated from the Shapley value predictions and violated two of its axioms [29]: null player and additivity. For all these reasons, we believe that the least core is a worthy alternative solution concept in general and also for XAI.

B.1 Additional Timing Experiment

In Figure 5, we replicate the weighted voting games timing experiment from Figure 2 but now for a weighted graph game, specifically the Newman Watts Strogatz game in Figure 1e with game parameters p and k sampled from [4, 24] and [0, 1] as indicated in the figure. We also display two additional runs of the Core Lagrangian approach with two different learning rates (LR) around the base learning rate: learning rate schedule = `linear_schedule(2 × LR, 0.1 × LR, 103)` with base $LR = 0.5$. Lastly, we report approximation quality for the Monte-Carlo Shapley values as measured by euclidean distance to its approximate ground truth value. In this case, the LP method outperforms the CL method suggesting it is important keep both approaches in mind when attempting to solve new problem domains.

C GRAPH GAMES

C.1 Other graph games

We present 4 more graph games to complement Section 4.2.2:

Partition Graph are graphs where the vertices are split into n partitions. Similar to the Erdős-Rényi graph, an edge occurs between vertices *within* a partition with probability p_{in} and with probability p_{out} *across* partitions. **Dual Barabasi Albert** graphs




Figure 5: Approximation quality of the linear program (LP), core Lagrangian (CL), and Shapley method as a function of computation time (seconds). The x -axis corresponds to wall-clock time taken by all algorithms run side-by-side given $k \in \{500, 1000, 2000, 4000, 8000, 16000\}$ sampled coalitions for the LP method, t_k . A better core approximation quality is reflected in having a lower ϵ for the same runtime. The left y -axis represents the approximate ϵ of the least-core solution found, $\hat{\epsilon}(p_{LP}, \hat{C})$ and $\hat{\epsilon}(p_{CL}, \hat{C})$, computed over the same set of 2^{25} coalitions, \hat{C} . As the Shapley solution is not motivated by stability, we measure the approximate solution’s quality by euclidean distance to the Shapley value estimated with 10 million Monte-Carlo samples. Each Shapley approximation is estimated using $125 \times k$ samples. Each data point $(t_k, \hat{\epsilon}(p_x, \hat{C}))$ represents an average over the same set of 2, 500 random weighted voting games with shading indicating standard error of the mean.

are generated by connecting each new vertex with either m_1 edges with probability p or m_2 edges with probability $1 - p$ [60] (with edge targets selected at random from the current vertices). **Powerlaw Clusters** are graphs with a powerlaw degree distribution and approximate average clustering [43], where m is the number of edges to randomly add to each node and p is the probability of adding a triangle after adding each edge. **Random Uniform Intersection** A random subset of m elements is assigned to every vertex in a graph, each element being assigned independently with probability p . An edge between two vertices exists if their element subsets intersect.

We observe in Figure 6 that similarly to Erdős-Rényi, partition graphs have the opposite phenomenon of a small corner of the space with stable games (low p_{in} and p_{out}), with the games with moderate values of the two parameters being less stable. In contrast, Dual Barabasi Albert graphs have stable games when both parameters have medium values, with less stability as either of the parameters deviating from these values. Finally, similarly to Newman Watts Strogatz, Intersection graphs indicate a spectrum between stable and unstable games (with the p parameter having strong influence in Intersection graphs, and k parameter having the stronger influence on stability in NWS graphs).

C.2 Example Graphs

Figure 7 presents an example of an induced subgraph game, describing how the characteristic function is calculated in this game.




Figure 6: Mean LCV for different classes of graphs when sweeping over two hyperparameters. Constant hyperparameters are shown in parenthesis.




Figure 7: Example graph game with 9 players. The coalition with players $\{1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8\}$ has payoff $a+e+g+f+j$, the coalition with players $\{3, 6\}$ has payoff h , and the coalition with players $\{9\}$ has payoff 0 (as do all singleton coalitions). Intuitively, the edges correspond to synergies between players that are only realised if they are in the same coalition.

Figures 9 show examples of randomly generated graphs, of the various classes considered in the paper, along with their representation as weighted adjacency matrices.

C.2.1 Marginal Contribution Networks. The final class of games we study are the marginal contribution networks (MCNs) [45]. In an MCN, the cooperative game is defined by a set of rules $\{r_1, \dots, r_k\}$ such that each rule takes the form $r = (P, N)$ where $P, N \subseteq I$ refer to the positive and negative parts respectively. Given a coalition $C \subseteq I$, a rule $r = (P, N)$ applies to C if and only if $P \subseteq C$ and $C \cap N = \emptyset$. Clearly multiple rules can apply to a coalition and so we let R_C be the set of rules that apply to C . The resulting characteristic function is thus $v(C) = \sum_{r \in R_C} w(r)$.




Figure 8: Mean least-core value over 200 randomly generated MCNs (10 players, $k = 10$ rules).

Dataset	# of Features	# of Samples	Task
Breast Cancer	569	30	Classification
Diabetes	442	10	Regression
Wine	178	13	Classification
Boston Housing	506	13	Regression

Table 3: Statistics of ML Tasks in XAI Experiments

To generate random MCNs, we generate k rules, each using the following sampling process: for each player, they are included in P with probability p , and in N with probability q . If an agent is selected for both P and N the rule is discarded and re-sampled.

Figure 8 shows the impact of the parameters on the expected least-core value. In Figure 8a we vary p and q while in Figure 8b we change both the number of rules and the number of players. In particular, we observe that the expected least-core value (and hence, the expected stability of the game) depends on all four parameters. For example, games with low p but high q (i.e. coalitions are more likely to not have any rules apply to them) are very stable, but so are games with few rules and many agents. These insights open up new research questions such as the possibility for designing special-purpose algorithms for MCNs under specific parameter-regimes.

D XAI: DATASETS AND ADDITIONAL EXPERIMENTS

D.1 Datasets

We list statistics of our XAI datasets in Table 3. We used 80% of the data for training and kept 20% aside for testing and measuring the performance of the AI model.

D.2 Additional Data Valuation Experiments

We repeated the data valuation experiment described in Section 5 on all the datasets presented in the global and local experiments. Recall that data valuation assigns importances to each data point rather than features. Figure 10 shows a similar trend that removing the top data points the least core seems to be more critical for model performance than Shapley values. The trend sometimes switches after 40-50% of data removed.




Figure 9: Example adjacency matrices and vertex and edge plots of different graph classes.




Figure 10: Data Valuation Experiments from Section 5.3 on the Wine and Diabetes datasets.