

nn2poly: An R Package for Converting Neural Networks into Interpretable Polynomials

Pablo Morala
Universidad Carlos III de Madrid

J. Alexandra Cifuentes
Universidad Pontificia Comillas

Rosa E. Lillo
Universidad Carlos III de Madrid

Iñaki Ucar
Universidad Carlos III de Madrid

Abstract

The **nn2poly** package provides the implementation in R of the NN2Poly method to explain and interpret feed-forward neural networks by means of polynomial representations that predict in an equivalent manner as the original network. Through the obtained polynomial coefficients, the effect and importance of each variable and their interactions on the output can be represented. This capability of capturing interactions is a key aspect usually missing from most Explainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI) methods, specially if they rely on expensive computations that can be amplified when used on large neural networks. The package provides integration with the main deep learning framework packages in R (**tensorflow** and **torch**), allowing an user-friendly application of the NN2Poly algorithm. Furthermore, **nn2poly** provides implementation of the required weight constraints to be used during the network training in those same frameworks. Other neural networks packages can also be used by including their weights in `list` format. Polynomials obtained with **nn2poly** can also be used to predict with new data or be visualized through its own plot method. Simulations are provided exemplifying the usage of the package alongside with a comparison with other approaches available in R to interpret neural networks.

Keywords: R, neural networks, interpretability, XAI, polynomials.

1. Introduction

Machine Learning (ML) and Artificial Intelligence (AI) have based their recent advances and success mainly on the use of neural networks, specially with the development of deep learning (LeCun, Bengio, and Hinton 2015). Despite their widespread adoption in almost every field, several concerns exist still about their inner workings, specifically about their opaque nature, often considered black boxes (Benitez, Castro, and Requena 1997; Shwartz-Ziv and Tishby 2017). Significant efforts have been aimed towards increasing the explainability or interpretability of NNs, opening research fields such as eXplainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI).

Among the solutions proposed to address the black-box nature of AI, we can differentiate between model agnostic methods (such as SHAP (Lundberg and Lee 2017) or LIME (Ribeiro, Singh, and Guestrin 2016)) and other solutions tailored for an specific model, which in the neu-

ral networks case can be found in examples such as Layer-wise Relevance Propagation (LRP) (Bach, Binder, Montavon, Klauschen, Müller, and Samek 2015), Gradient based methods (Baehrens, Schroeter, Harmeling, Kawanabe, Hansen, and Müller 2010; Simonyan, Vedaldi, and Zisserman 2014) with variants such as SmoothGrad (Smilkov, Thorat, Kim, Viégas, and Wattenberg 2017), DeepLift (Shrikumar, Greenside, and Kundaje 2019), or sensitivity based analysis methods like the one implemented in **NeuralSens** (Pizarroso, Portela, and Muñoz 2022). In this context, there have been several proposals trying to bring together neural networks and polynomial models, as the polynomials are an inherently interpretable models due to the explanation of their coefficients. An initial proposed approach was to explore the integration of polynomial functions with neural networks, drawing inspiration from classical statistical techniques (Chen, Manry, Yeung, Devarajan, Bredow, and Levine 1998; Chen and Manry 1990, 1993). This idea was based in the universal approximation theorems of the 1990s (Cybenko 1989; Hornik, Stinchcombe, and White 1989; Hornik 1991), using polynomial basis functions to establish relationships with multilayer perceptrons (MLPs), offering an alternative framework for model representation and analysis. This methodology relied on solving optimization problems via a Least-Mean-Square approach to determine polynomial coefficients.

In recent years, with the advances in deep learning, there has been a renewed interest in the union between neural networks and polynomial models, with methods such as Deep Polynomial Neural Networks (or Π -networks) (Chrysos, Moschoglou, Bouritsas, Deng, Panagakis, and Zafeiriou 2022). These models use high-order polynomials to capture complex interactions, which are trained by representing interactions via high-order tensors and employing factor sharing techniques. This approach allows these models to reduce the computational cost associated with modeling all possible interactions (Rendle 2010). Additionally, other architectures like quadratic networks have emerged, increasing network expressiveness through quadratic functions instead of traditional inner products within neurons (Fan, Li, Wang, Lai, and Wang 2023). In general, these advancements showcase the increasing interest on polynomial models as viable alternatives to traditional neural networks, particularly in tasks requiring interpretability and feature interaction modeling.

Following this trend of trying to benefit from the inherently interpretable nature of polynomials, the NN2poly method (Morala, Cifuentes, Lillo, and Ucar 2023) proposes an algorithm to transform pre-existing MLPs, i.e., already trained networks, into polynomial representations. This method extends to deeper layers a previous approach that was limited to single hidden layer MLPs (Morala, Cifuentes, Lillo, and Ucar 2021). Unlike other polynomial approaches that focus on training specialized architectures with polynomial outputs, NN2Poly enables the interpretation of existing neural networks through polynomial approximations of their internal parameters. Layer by layer, the polynomials that represent the network are built iteratively, using the internal weights and activation functions approximated by Taylor expansion. It is important to note that for these approximations to work, certain weight constraints need to be imposed during training. This method is particularly suited for tabular data applications, where the statistical interpretation of polynomial coefficients are directly applicable. Furthermore, the obtained polynomials provide interpretation, through their coefficients, to variable interactions instead of single variables, a key difference with many of the most adopted interpretability approaches.

This article presents the **nn2poly** package (Morala and Ucar 2024) for R (R Core Team 2023), which allows the application of the NN2Poly method to MLP neural networks and therefore

explain their predictions using an equivalent polynomial, with interpretable coefficients both for the single variables and their interactions. The package supports the two current main deep learning frameworks, **Torch** and **Tensorflow**, while neural networks from other arbitrary frameworks can easily be used by extracting their weights and activation functions. Additionally, the package provides functions to impose needed constraints during the neural network training in **Torch** and **Tensorflow**.

The rest of the article is structured as follows. The remaining part of Section 1 provides an overview on interpretability software and neural network training software in R. Then, Section 2 presents the fundamental concepts and theory behind the NN2Poly method. Section 3 explains in detail the **nm2poly** package functions and structure with regression examples based on polynomial data. Section 3.7 shows the method employed on a classification example and Section 4 compares the obtained results on the polynomial examples when explained through other alternative packages. Finally, Section 5 summarizes the contributions of this work.

1.1. Related interpretability software

Regarding related software, there exists a broad offer of interpretability or XAI packages in R with general model agnostic interpretability options, and also some with neural networks specific options. The following list provides an overview of the current options available in R for these matters:

- **SHAP** based interpretability: SHapley Additive exPlanations (SHAP) (Lundberg and Lee 2017) has been established as one of the main methods in interpretable and explainable machine learning, along with its many extensions. This method quantifies the contribution of each feature to the final model based on cooperative game theory concepts. It has an official implementation by the authors in Python. In R, there are several implementations, such as **shapper** (Maksymiuk, Gosiewska, and Biecek 2020) which is a wrapper of the Python implementation, or **fastshap** (Greenwell 2024), **explainer** (R. Zargari Marandi 2024), **shapr** (Sellereite, Jullum, and Redelmeier 2023) and **shapley** (E. F. Haghish 2023) that provide alternative implementations with different improvements. There are also several model specific SHAP versions, specially focused on tree based model, but they are not applicable to neural networks. Furthermore, there are also visualization specific packages such as **shapviz** (Mayer 2024), which allows the creation of importance plots from different interpretability results.
- **LIME** based interpretability: Local Interpretable Model-agnostic Explanations (LIME) (Ribeiro *et al.* 2016) is another method widely used in the XAI community, which provides explanations by learning an interpretable model locally around the desired prediction. This approach is model agnostic also, and its original implementation is provided in Python. However, there are also implementations in R such as **lime** (Hvitfeldt, Pedersen, and Benesty 2022) which is a port of the original implementation or **live** (Staniak and Biecek 2018) and **localModel** (Biecek and Staniak 2021) which are alternative implementations.
- **Other model agnostic methods**: Besides SHAP and LIME, there are other proposals for model agnostic methods that can also be employed on neural networks. Some of them, but not all, are: **ale** (Okoli 2023) implementing ALE plots, **iml** (Molnar, Bischl, and Casalicchio 2018) and **distillML** (Cho, Saarinen, Sekhon, and Walter 2023) which both implement several methods like PDP plots, ALE plots, surrogate models

or even SHAP values in the former, **breakDown** (Staniak and Biecek 2018) implements another method that decomposes predictions into parts that can be attributed to specific features, and **DALEX** (Biecek 2018) implements an ecosystem with several levels of explanations, some of them also based on SHAP.

- **Neural Network specific** interpretability:
 - **NeuralSens** (González, Roque, and Gonzalo 2024): This package provides sensitivity analysis of neural networks using a partial derivatives method. This method is implemented specifically for MLPs (same as NN2Poly), where partial derivatives of the output with respect to the input are computed. Several plots and graphical interpretations of the results are provided.
 - **innsight** (Koenen and Baudeu 2023): This package implements several XAI techniques for neural networks, such as LRP, DeepLift or gradient-based methods, among other model agnostic methods applicable to neuronal networks like SHAP or LIME.
 - **NeuralNetTools** (Beck 2018): This package provides visualization of neural network weights and feature importance through the Olden (Olden, Joy, and Death 2004) and Garson (Garson 1991) methods.

This overview covers the majority of applicable methods to interpretability of neural networks in R either through specific methods or model agnostic methods. Additionally, there are many specific packages for other models, specially for tree based models or XGBoost, such as **treeshap** (Komisararczyk, Kozminski, Maksymiuk, and Biecek 2024) or **randomForestExplainer** (Paluszynska, Biecek, and Jiang 2020). Furthermore, some packages implement inherently interpretable models such as **neuralGAM** (Ortega-Fernandez and Sestelo 2024), a DL framework based on Generalized Additive Models, and **interpret** (Jenkins, Nori, Koch, and Caruana 2023), which provides an implementation of Explainable Boosting Machines in R based on its Python implementation.

However, to the authors knowledge, the specific options for neural networks interpretability do not include feature interactions. While some of the general XAI techniques have some proposed extensions to include interactions (such as SHAP), they are usually quite computationally expensive, (Sundararajan, Dhamdhere, and Agarwal 2020; Bordt and von Luxburg 2023; Tsai, Yeh, and Ravikumar 2023).

1.2. Related neural networks training software

Another key aspect of the package is the support provided for different options in the neural network training and even the possibility of imposing the custom constraints during training that allow an accurate approximation by NN2Poly. In this context, there is a significant difference between frameworks that allow the training of single hidden layers MLP and frameworks that have full capability of building deep learning models with several hidden layers. The two currently **nn2poly** supported models are the currently most used deep learning frameworks:

- **Tensorflow** (Abadi, Agarwal, Barham, Brevdo, Chen, Citro, Corrado, Davis, Dean, Devin, Ghemawat, Goodfellow, Harp, Irving, Isard, Jia, Jozefowicz, Kaiser, Kudlur, Levenberg, Mane, Monga, Moore, Murray, Olah, Schuster, Shlens, Steiner, Sutskever, Talwar, Tucker, Vanhoucke, Vasudevan, Viegas, Vinyals, Warden, Wattenberg, Wicke,

(Yu, and Zheng 2015) is an end-to-end machine learning platform. It has been one of the most widely used deep learning frameworks in recent years, both in research and industry, and it is supported and developed by Google. Their original implementation is built in Python, but there is also an implementation in the R package **tensorflow** (Allaire, Kalinowski, Falbel, Eddelbuettel, Tang [aut, cph, Golding, , Tutorials), Posit, and PBC 2024), which under the hood uses Python. Usually, **Tensorflow** is used together with the deep learning high level API Keras (Chollet and others 2015), also originally developed in Python. However, it also has an implementation in the R package **keras** (Kalinowski, Falbel, Allaire, Chollet, RStudio, Google, Tang [ctb, cph, Bijl, Studer, and Keydana 2023) that allows to work with this API from R, using Python again under the hood. **nn2poly** supports the usage of **tensorflow** models through **keras**.

- **Torch** (Collobert, Kavukcuoglu, and Farabet 2011) was a scientific computing and machine learning framework developed in 2011, which was the precursor of **PyTorch** (Paszke, Gross, Massa, Lerer, Bradbury, Chanan, Killeen, Lin, Gimelshein, Antiga, Desmaison, Köpf, Yang, DeVito, Raison, Tejani, Chilamkurthy, Steiner, Fang, Bai, and Chintala 2019). **PyTorch** has also been established as the main deep learning framework together with **Tensorflow**, both in research and industry. An implementation in R is provided in package **torch** (Falbel, Luraschi, Selivanov, Damiani, Regouby, Joachimiak, Badr, and RStudio 2023), which is the core package of the torch ecosystem in R. It provides GPU accelerated computations and general neural network abstractions for deep learning models inspired on **PyTorch**. However, differing from the **tensorflow** package explained previously, in this case Python is not needed to use the **torch** package, as it is natively implemented in R. In a similar manner as **keras**, the torch ecosystem contains package **luz** (Falbel and RStudio 2023) a higher level API implementation for easier model definition and training. There exists another framework based on **torch** in the form of the package **cito** (Amesoeeder, Hartig, and Pichler 2023), which uses a syntax inspired by standard R and other statistical packages. Currently, **nn2poly** supports the usage of **torch** models through **luz**. Support for **cito** is expected to be added in future versions.

There are also other options in R that are not currently supported by **nn2poly**, but may be included in the future. However, any model can be used as input to **nn2poly** as long as the weight matrices can be extracted. Furthermore, to be able to employ **nn2poly** accurately, it is advisable that custom constraints could be implemented in the chosen framework, condition that not all the available packages fulfill. Some examples of these other possible neural network training current options are **neuralnet** (Fritsch, Guenther, and Wright 2019), which supports MLP **ANN2** (Lammers 2020) and **nlib2Rcpp** (Nikolaidis 2021), both based on Cpp, or general packages for ML model training that include some forms of neural networks such as **h2o** (Fryda, LeDell, Gill, Aiello, Fu, Candell, Click, Kraljevic, Nykodym, Aboyou, Kurka, Malohlava, Poirier, and Wong 2024) or **caret** (Kuhn and Max 2008).

2. Theoretical background

In this section, the theoretical foundations of the NN2Poly algorithm (Morala *et al.* 2023) will be presented along with the needed notation. For further details, refer to the original work.

2.1. Neural networks and polynomials

The NN2Poly algorithm seeks to obtain an approximation of a given trained densely connected feed-forward neural networks, or Multi-Layer Perceptron (MLP), by means of one or several polynomials in the original variables. Therefore, the used notation for both neural networks and polynomials is introduced here. Note that during the rest of the paper, the term *neural networks* will be used in general to denote feed-forward MLPs.

We consider neural networks with $L - 1$ hidden layers and h_l neurons at each layer l . The input variables to the network are denoted by $\vec{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_p)$, with dimension p , and the output response is $\vec{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_c)$, with $c = 1$, if there is a single output (usual regression setting), and $c > 1$ if there is more than one output (usual classification setting with c classes). At any given layer l and neuron j , its output is ${}^{(l)}y_j$, while its inputs are the outputs from the previous layer, ${}^{(l-1)}y_i$ for $i \in 1, \dots, h_{l-1}$. By definition, the input to the first hidden layer is the network's input, ${}^{(0)}y_i = x_i$ for $i \in 1, \dots, p$. The network's final output is denoted by ${}^{(L)}y_j$ for $i \in 1, \dots, c$. ${}^{(l)}W$ denotes the weights matrix connecting layer $l - 1$ to layer l , where its element at row i and column j is denoted by ${}^{(l)}w_{ij}$, and ${}^{(l)}g$ is the activation function at that layer. Then, the output from each neuron $j = 1, \dots, h_l$ at layer l can be written as follows:

$${}^{(l)}y_j = {}^{(l)}g\left({}^{(l)}u_j\right) = {}^{(l)}g\left(\sum_{i=0}^{h_{l-1}} {}^{(l)}w_{ij} {}^{(l-1)}y_i\right), \quad (1)$$

where ${}^{(l)}u_j$ is the synaptic potential, i.e., the value computed at the neuron before applying the activation function. Note that the matrix ${}^{(l)}W$ has dimensions $(h_{l-1} + 1) \times h_l$, including the bias term ${}^{(l-1)}y_0 = 1$.

Polynomials will be denoted in general by P , and will be of the following form:

$$P = \beta_0 + \underbrace{\beta_1 x_1 + \dots + \beta_p x_p}_{\text{1-order interactions}} + \dots + \underbrace{\beta_{12} x_1 x_2 + \dots + \beta_{1\dots 1} x_1^Q + \dots + \beta_{p\dots p} x_p^Q}_{\text{Q-order interactions}}, \quad (2)$$

where p is the number of variables x_i and Q is the total order of the polynomial.

To simplify this notation, each monomial of order T can be represented by a vector $\vec{t} = (t_1, t_2, \dots, t_p)$, where each element t_i is an integer that represents the number of times that variable i appears in the monomial, i.e., the multiplicity of that variable, for all $i = 1, \dots, p$. Note that $T = \sum_{i=1}^p t_i$. As an example, the monomial containing the combination of variables $x_1^2 x_2 x_4$ in a polynomial with $p = 4$ will be:

$$B_{(2,1,0,1)} = \beta_{(2,1,0,1)} \cdot x_1^2 x_2 x_4,$$

where B is used for the monomial, i.e., the coefficient and the variables as a whole, and β is used for the coefficient itself.

Using this representation, Equation 2 can be written using the multiplicities as:

$$P = \sum_{\vec{t} \in \mathcal{T}(p, Q)} B_{\vec{t}} = \sum_{\vec{t} \in \mathcal{T}(p, Q)} \beta_{\vec{t}} \cdot x_1^{t_1} \dots x_p^{t_p}, \quad (3)$$

where $\mathcal{T}(p, Q)$ is the set of all possible vectors \vec{t} , for a given number of variables p and total order Q , and considering all interactions. Note that its cardinality is $|\mathcal{T}(p, Q)|$ the total number of terms in the polynomial, which will be denoted by $N_{p, Q}$. For convenience, the intercept will be denoted as $\beta_{(0)}$.

2.2. NN2Poly method

The goal is to find a polynomial representation for a neural network, particularly to handle the non-linear activations of hidden neurons. For MLPs with a single hidden layer, a solution was introduced in (Morala *et al.* 2021), focusing on regression problems. This method uses Taylor expansion on the activation functions and applies combinatorial properties to determine the coefficients for each variable combination in the final output. Since Taylor expansions result in polynomials and the linear combinations of neurons can also be represented as polynomials, this approach effectively creates a polynomial that mirrors the neural network's behavior.

The extension of this idea to arbitrarily deep neural networks and both classification and regression problems was provided by the NN2Poly method in (Morala *et al.* 2023). In this work, the polynomials are built following a similar approach where each neuron at each layer is represented as a polynomial. This method is based on an iterative approach, which will yield two polynomials at each neuron j and layer l , one as the input to the non-linearity or activation function (denoted by the prefix in), and a second one as the output (denoted by the prefix out):

$$\text{in}P_j^{(l)} = \sum_{\vec{t} \in \mathcal{T}(p, Q)} \text{in}B_{j, \vec{t}}^{(l)}, \quad \text{and} \quad \text{out}P_j^{(l)} = \sum_{\vec{t} \in \mathcal{T}(p, Q)} \text{out}B_{j, \vec{t}}^{(l)}, \quad (4)$$

following the notation from Equation 3. Note that the two polynomials at the same layer will be related by the application of the activation function at such a layer, $^{(l)}g()$, as follows:

$$\text{out}P_j^{(l)} \approx ^{(l)}g\left(\text{in}P_j^{(l)}\right). \quad (5)$$

The key step is to be able to perform Taylor expansion of the activation function, but considering another polynomial as input to that function. The result used to perform this approximation is as follows:

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\text{in}P$ be a polynomial of order Q in p variables and $g()$ a k -times differentiable function. Applying a Taylor expansion around 0 and up to order q yields a new polynomial $\text{out}P$ in the same variables, of order $Q \times q$, whose coefficients are given by*

$$\text{out}\beta_{\vec{t}} = \sum_{n=0}^q \frac{g^{(n)}(0)}{n!} \sum_{\vec{n} \in \pi(\vec{t}, Q, n)} \binom{n}{\vec{n}} \prod_{k=1}^{N_{p, Q}} \text{in}\beta_k^{n_k}, \quad (6)$$

for all $\vec{t} \in \mathcal{T}(p, Q \times q)$, where $\pi(\vec{t}, Q, n)$ is the set of vectors $\vec{n} = (n_1, \dots, n_{N_{p, Q}})$ that represents all the possible combinations of terms $\text{in}\beta$ needed to obtain $\text{out}\beta$, satisfying the following conditions:

- **Condition 1:** $n_1 + \dots + n_M = n$.
- **Condition 2:** For all k , the order T_k of the monomial $\text{in}B_k$ associated to $\text{in}\beta_k$ must satisfy that $T_k \leq Q$.

Algorithm 1 NN2Poly Algorithm

Require: Weight matrices ${}^{(l)}W$, activation functions ${}^{(l)}g$, Taylor truncation order at each layer q_l , maximum order Q_{\max} .

- 1: **Compute** all multiset partitions for every equivalent M_0 needed for a polynomial of order Q_{\max} in p variables.
- 2: Set ${}^{(1)}P_j = {}^{(1)}u_j$ for all $j = 1, \dots, h_1$.
- 3: **for** $l = 1, \dots, L - 1$ **do**
- 4: **for** $j = 1, \dots, h_l$ **do**
- 5: **Compute** the coefficients, only up to order Q_l^* , from ${}^{(l)}P_j \approx g\left({}^{(l)}P_j\right)$ using Lemma 2.1.
- 6: **end for**
- 7: **for** $j = 1, \dots, h_{l+1}$ **do**
- 8: **Compute** the coefficients, only up to order Q_l^* , from ${}^{(l+1)}P_j = \sum_{i=0}^{h_l} {}^{(l+1)}w_{ij} {}^{(l)}P_i$
- 9: **end for**
- 10: **end for**
- 11: **if** Non-linear output at last layer **then**
- 12: **for** $j = 1, \dots, h_{L+1}$ **do**
- 13: **Compute** the coefficients, only up to order Q_l^* , from ${}^{(L)}P_j \approx g\left({}^{(L)}P_j\right)$ using Lemma 2.1.
- 14: **end for**
- 15: **end if**

Note in the previous lemma that the polynomial coefficients inside the product are represented as ${}_{\text{in}}\beta_k^{n_k}$ for all $k = 1, \dots, N_{p,Q}$ instead of with the vector $\vec{t} = (t_1, t_2, \dots, t_p)$ notation, but both of them are equivalent and the k notation allows the product to be written as $\prod_{k=1}^{N_{p,Q}}$. Further details in (Morala *et al.* 2023).

The final algorithm implementation of the NN2Poly algorithm is given in Algorithm 1:

As shown in Algorithm 1, a maximum order for the obtained polynomial is set as Q_{\max} , avoiding thus an exponential increase in the number of interactions as the final polynomial order would increase multiplicatively at each layer with the chosen order for the Taylor expansion.

Furthermore, it is important to note that there need to be some constraints on the original weights of the neural network, namely keeping the weights vectors norm (including the bias) of the hidden layers lower than a given value. This is implemented in **nn2poly**, as explained in Section 3.3.

2.3. Efficiency improvements

The proposed algorithm relies on being able to compute the set of vectors $\pi(\vec{t}, Q, n)$ defined in Lemma 2.1, which is a non trivial combinatorial problem. For each vector \vec{t} , this defines the set of all possible combinations of terms in the previous polynomial ${}_{\text{in}}\beta$ that, when multiplied together, are needed to obtain the desired output coefficient ${}_{\text{out}}\beta$. This problem can be converted in a combinatorial problem in terms of multisets. As explained in Morala *et al.* (2023), each vector $\vec{t} = (t_1, t_2, \dots, t_p)$ can be represented by a multiset M given by

$$M = \left\{ \underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{t_1}, \underbrace{2, \dots, 2}_{t_2}, \dots, \underbrace{p, \dots, p}_{t_p} \right\}, \quad (7)$$

where each variable i appears t_i times in the multiset. Consider as an example the monomial

$x_1^2 x_2 x_4$. Then, its associated coefficient using the vector \vec{t} notation would be $(2, 1, 0, 1)$, and the associated multiset M would be $\{1, 1, 2, 4\}$. With this multinomial notation, the problem of finding all terms in the previous polynomial that, when multiplied, yield the combination of variables denoted by M is reduced to finding all possible partitions of said multiset M . Finding all possible partitions of a multiset can be done employing Algorithm 3 from Morala *et al.* (2023), which is based in a proposal from Knuth (2005). This method can be employed on all multisets, but as the number of variables and order of the polynomial grows, the number of polynomial coefficients rapidly increases with a multiset associated to each of them. To mitigate the computational burden of this situation, it can be noticed that there are equivalencies in the monomials. For instance, computing the partitions of multiset $\{1, 1, 2, 4\}$ is equivalent to computing them for multiset $\{2, 2, 3, 5\}$ or $\{1, 3, 5, 5\}$, as long as the number of distinct elements and their multiplicities are the same (see Section IV.C of Morala *et al.* (2023) for further details).

The manipulation of multinomial partitions and their equivalent representations are implemented in C++ to further reduce computational times.

3. Package structure

The package is built around one main function, `nn2poly()`, where the algorithm of NN2Poly is implemented. This function receives a neural network, and returns a polynomial represented as a new S3 object named `nn2poly`, also defined inside the package. Then, `plot()` and `predict()` methods are implemented to be used on the `nn2poly` class. Additionally, two functions are defined to properly build and train neural networks with the desired constraints and structure to be used with `nn2poly()`, namely `add_constraints()` and `luz_model_sequential()`.

3.1. Polynomial structure

Given that the main objective with NN2Poly is to obtain a polynomial model equivalent to the original neural network, we will introduce here the structure used in the `nn2poly` package to define polynomials. This structure will be used in the main function `nn2poly()` output, but we first introduce it here as it can also be useful when generating synthetic data for the given examples.

A single polynomial will be represented as a list with two elements, named `labels` and `values`:

- Item `labels` is a list of integer vectors. Each of those vectors represents a monomial in the polynomial, where each integer in the vector represents each time one of the original variables appears in that term. As an example, vector `c(1,1,2)` represents the term $x_1 \cdot x_1 \cdot x_2 = x_1^2 x_2$. Note that the variables are numbered from 1 to p , with the intercept being represented by 0.
- Item `values` contains a column vector with the coefficients of the polynomial, where each element in the vector is the coefficient associated with the monomial or label at the same position in the `labels` item.

Let's see an example with the polynomial:

$$Y = 4 + 2X_1 - X_2X_3 + 3X_4X_5$$

which is built as follows:

```
R> polynomial_simple <- list()
R> polynomial_simple$labels <- list(c(0), c(1), c(2, 3), c(4, 5))
R> polynomial_simple$values <- c(4, 2, -1, 3)
```

If instead of a single vector we wanted to represent multiple vectors with the same labels or monomials, item `values` can be a matrix instead of a vector, where each column contains the coefficients for each vector. For example, the following two polynomials:

$$Y = 4 + 2X_1 - X_2X_3 + 3X_4X_5$$

$$Y = 1 - 3X_1 + 2X_2X_3 + X_4X_5$$

```
R> polynomial_multi <- list()
R> polynomial_multi$labels <- list(c(0), c(1), c(2, 3), c(4, 5))
R> polynomial_multi$values <- cbind(c(4, 2, -1, 3), c(1, -3, 2, 1))
```

This representation of multiple polynomials with the same monomials but different coefficients will be employed in the **nn2poly** output when representing a neural network with multiple output units, as in a classification problem, as in Section 3.7.

3.2. Neural network input

The package currently supports 3 possible ways of using a neural network as input: the default input object as a list of weight matrices, a **tensorflow**-based **keras** sequential object or a **torch**-based **luz** sequential object:

Generic list input

The `nn2poly()` function allows users to input any pre-trained neural network from any framework. The input is a list of matrices, each representing the weight matrices of the network layers in sequence. These matrices must include bias vectors as the first row, with each subsequent row representing the weights of input neurons at that layer. For a layer $l + 1$, the weight matrix dimensions are $(1 + h_l) \times h_{l+1}$, where h_l is the number of neurons in layer l . The activation function for each layer is specified by the name of the corresponding matrix in the list. Supported activation functions include hyperbolic tangent, sigmoid, and softplus. The package can implement other differentiable activation functions, though it cannot handle the non-differentiable ReLU due to theoretical constraints.

As an illustrative example of a list input to `nn2poly()`, suppose a neural network with an input dimension of 5, two hidden layers containing 2 and 3 neurons respectively, using hyperbolic tangent and sigmoid activation functions, and an output layer with 1 neuron and a linear activation function. Then, the list that represents the network in order to use it as input of `nn2poly()` will have the following structure (note that all layers have bias weights).

```

R> # We will fill the weights as 0s for the bias and 1s for the kernel weights
R> # just to show an example of the required dimensions.
R> dim_input <- 5
R> dim_layer_1 <- 2
R> fun_layer_1 <- "tanh"
R> bias_weights_layer_1 <- matrix(0, nrow = 1, ncol = dim_layer_1)
R> kernel_weights_layer_1 <- matrix(1, nrow = dim_input, ncol = dim_layer_1)
R>
R> dim_layer_2 <- 3
R> fun_layer_2 <- "sigmoid"
R> bias_weights_layer_2 <- matrix(0, nrow = 1, ncol = dim_layer_2)
R> kernel_weights_layer_2 <- matrix(1, nrow = dim_layer_1, ncol = dim_layer_2)
R>
R> dim_output <- 1
R> fun_output <- "linear"
R> bias_weights_layer_output <- matrix(0, nrow = 1, ncol = dim_output)
R> kernel_weights_layer_output <- matrix(1, nrow = dim_layer_2, ncol = dim_output)
R>
R> # Final input list:
R> nn_list <- list(
+   rbind(bias_weights_layer_1, kernel_weights_layer_1),
+   rbind(bias_weights_layer_2, kernel_weights_layer_2),
+   rbind(bias_weights_layer_output, kernel_weights_layer_output))
R> names(nn_list) <- c(fun_layer_1, fun_layer_2, fun_output)
R> nn_list

```

```
$tanh
```

```

      [,1] [,2]
[1,]    0    0
[2,]    1    1
[3,]    1    1
[4,]    1    1
[5,]    1    1
[6,]    1    1

```

```
$sigmoid
```

```

      [,1] [,2] [,3]
[1,]    0    0    0
[2,]    1    1    1
[3,]    1    1    1

```

```
$linear
```

```

      [,1]
[1,]    0
[2,]    1
[3,]    1
[4,]    1

```

Building this object with the appropriate format is left to the user when wanting to apply `nn2poly()` to a neural network from a non supported framework. However, the supported frameworks can be directly used with `nn2poly()` as the adequate input format is built internally for each method. Therefore, providing support for new deep learning formats can be rapidly implemented by extending the internal functions to get weights and activation functions from models of that new framework's class. In particular, currently supported input formats are sequential models in **keras** and **luz**. For each framework we provide an example of a sequential model.

keras sequential input

nn2poly provides support for **tensorflow/keras** models composed of a linear stack of layers, which can be built using the `keras::keras_model_sequential()` function. These models can be directly fed to `nn2poly()`, which internally extracts and reshapes its needed parameters (weight matrices and activation function names) to comply with the list format explained before.

As an illustrative example we will replicate here how to create a **keras** network with the structure shown in the list input example:

```
R> # keras required (which also requires tensorflow and Python installed)
R> library("keras")
R> tensorflow::set_random_seed(42)
R>
R> nn_toy_keras <- keras_model_sequential() %>%
+   layer_dense(units = 2, activation = "tanh", input_shape = 5) %>%
+   layer_dense(units = 3, activation = "sigmoid") %>%
+   layer_dense(units = 1, activation = "linear")
R> nn_toy_keras
```

Model: "sequential"

Layer (type)	Output Shape	Param #
dense_2 (Dense)	(None, 2)	12
dense_1 (Dense)	(None, 3)	9
dense (Dense)	(None, 1)	4

=====
Total params: 25 (100.00 Byte)
Trainable params: 25 (100.00 Byte)
Non-trainable params: 0 (0.00 Byte)
=====

luz sequential input

The **nn2poly** package provides support for models in sequential form, i.e., composed of a linear stack of layers. In this case, we provide the helper function `luz_model_sequential()` to facilitate the creation of such models. Then, they can be directly fed to `nn2poly()`,

which internally extracts and reshapes its needed parameters (weight matrices and activation function names) to comply with the list format explained before.

As an illustrative example, we will replicate the structure shown in the list input example: a neural network with an input dimension of 5, two hidden layers containing 2 and 3 neurons respectively, using hyperbolic tangent and sigmoid activation functions, and an output layer with 1 neuron and a linear activation function.

```
R> # luz and torch required
R> library("luz")
R> library("torch")
R>
R> # Create a luz sequential model with the helper function
R> nn_toy_luz <- nn2poly::luz_model_sequential(
+   nn_linear(5, 2),
+   nn_tanh(),
+   nn_linear(2, 3),
+   nn_sigmoid(),
+   nn_linear(3, 1)
+ )
R> nn_toy_luz
```

```
<nn_sequential> object generator
  Inherits from: <inherit>
  Public:
    .classes: nn_sequential nn_module
    args: list
    initialize: function ()
    forward: function (input)
    clone: function (deep = FALSE, ..., replace_values = TRUE)
  Private:
    .__clone_r6__: function (deep = FALSE)
  Parent env: <environment: 0x564385a680b8>
  Locked objects: FALSE
  Locked class: FALSE
  Portable: TRUE
```

3.3. Neural network training with constraints

Before getting into how the `nn2poly()` function is implemented, we introduce a feature that allows the use of weight constraints during the neural network training. The NN2Poly theoretical method depends on the effectiveness of the Taylor expansion performed at each neuron. Therefore, if the neural networks is trained without any constraints on the weights, the obtained polynomial may not be accurate or even greatly diverge on its predictions due to an asymptotic behavior on the Taylor expansions. To avoid this, weight constraints can be used as explained in Section 2, where the norm of weight vectors at hidden layers can be limited to have absolute value lower than one. This condition has to be imposed during training,

and therefore we provide an implementation to add such a restriction in the supported deep learning frameworks.

To do so, the package provides function `add_constraints()` that can be used on any sequential neural network from the supported frameworks explained previously (Tensorflow+Keras or Torch+Luz). The approach used to introduce the constraints consists of using callbacks that are employed during training when using `fit` on the model. Specifically, the callbacks are applied at the end of each train batch, on each weight vector (columns in the weight matrices in our standard format, thus representing the weights incident on a neuron, with the bias as the first element and the rest of the weights sequentially in the rest of the vector). For each of those vectors w , a new weight vector is computed as follows:

$$\vec{w}_{new} = \vec{w} \times \frac{c(\|\vec{w}\|)}{\|\vec{w}\| + \epsilon}$$

where function $c()$ is defined as as:

$$c(x) = \begin{cases} x & \text{if } x \in [0, 1] \\ 1 & \text{if } x > 1. \end{cases}$$

This computation leaves the weight vector unchanged if its norm is less than 1, and scales it to a new vector with a norm of 1 if its previous norm was greater than 1. The implemented norms are the *l1-norm* and the *l2-norm*:

$$\|\vec{w}\|_1 = \sum_{i=0}^p |w_i| \quad \text{and} \quad \|\vec{w}\|_2 = \sqrt{\sum_{i=0}^p w_i^2}.$$

Using function `add_constraints(model, type)` adds class "nn2poly" to the given model, and a new model attribute named "constraint" which stores the type of norm to be used during training (either "l1_norm" or "l2_norm"). This allows the use of method `fit.nn2poly()`, which builds the callback before calling the appropriate `fit()` method for each given model, where the training will be performed as usual within the models framework but with the desired constraint included as a callback in said framework.

Note that, if the batch size is too small, the computational time of the callbacks may be of similar magnitude as the batch training time, which may produce some warnings depending on the used framework.

Data generation

In order to show an example on how this constraints are used during training with each supported framework, we will first generate some synthetic data. This data will be of polynomial nature for the sake of being able to compare the results obtained later with `nn2poly()`. Following the polynomial notation defined in Section 3.1, the example polynomial will be:

$$Y = 2 - 2X_1 + 5X_2X_3 + 3X_4$$

```
R> # Polynomial with interactions
R> poly <- list()
R> poly$labels <- list(c(0), c(1), c(2, 3), c(4))
R> poly$values <- c(2, -2, 5, 3)
```

Note how only four variables are considered in the polynomial, however, data will be generated with dimension $p = 5$. Then, as variable X_5 does not appear in the polynomial, the neural network should not capture any effect and therefore it should neither appear in the explanations.

To demonstrate data generation from this polynomial, we will use here an internal function of **nn2poly**, namely `nn2poly:::eval_poly()`, which takes a polynomial in the previously defined structure and evaluates it on the given data. Note that, as this is an internal function, it may not be supported with the same syntax in future versions.

```
R> # Define number of variables and sample size
R> set.seed(42)
R> p <- 5
R> n <- 500
R>
R> # Predictor variables X and response variable Y + small error term
R> x <- matrix(rnorm(n * p, 0, 1), n, p)
R> y <- nn2poly:::eval_poly(poly = poly, newdata = x) + rnorm(n, 0, 0.05)
R> data_reg <- as.data.frame(cbind(x, y))
R> head(data_reg)
```

	V1	V2	V3	V4	V5	y
1	1.3709584	1.029140719	2.3250585	-0.6013830	0.2505781	9.448863
2	-0.5646982	0.914774868	0.5241222	-0.1358161	-0.2779240	5.118990
3	0.3631284	-0.002456267	0.9707334	-0.9872728	-1.7247357	-1.704560
4	0.6328626	0.136009552	0.3769734	0.8319250	-2.0067049	3.506408
5	0.4042683	-0.720153545	-0.9959334	-0.7950595	-1.2918083	2.421855
6	-0.1061245	-0.198124330	-0.5974829	0.3404646	0.3658382	3.824678

In order to properly use this data when training a neural network, we will first scale the data to the $[-1, 1]$ interval and split in train and test datasets:

```
R> # Data scaling to [-1,1]
R> maxs <- apply(data_reg, 2, max)
R> mins <- apply(data_reg, 2, min)
R> data_reg <- as.data.frame(scale(data_reg,
+                               center = mins + (maxs - mins) / 2,
+                               scale = (maxs - mins) / 2))
R>
R> # Divide in train (0.75) and test (0.25)
R> set.seed(42)
R> i <- sample(1:nrow(data_reg), round(0.75 * nrow(data_reg)))
R> train_reg_x <- as.matrix(data_reg[ i, ], -(p+1))
R> train_reg_y <- as.matrix(data_reg[ i, ], (p+1))
R> test_reg_x <- as.matrix(data_reg[-i, ], -(p+1))
R> test_reg_y <- as.matrix(data_reg[-i, ], (p+1))
```

Constraints and training

Here we will build a **keras** model and then add the required constraints to it using the method provided by **nn2poly**.

```
R> library("nn2poly")
R> tensorflow::set_random_seed(42)
R>
R> nn_reg <- keras_model_sequential() %>%
+   layer_dense(units = 50, activation = "tanh", input_shape = 5) %>%
+   layer_dense(units = 100, activation = "tanh") %>%
+   layer_dense(units = 50, activation = "tanh") %>%
+   layer_dense(units = 1, activation = "linear")
R>
R> # Add the constraints
R> nn_reg_const <- add_constraints(nn_reg, type = "l1_norm")
R>
R> # We can see how it preserves the original structure:
R> nn_reg_const
```

Model: "sequential_1"

Layer (type)	Output Shape	Param #
dense_6 (Dense)	(None, 50)	300
dense_5 (Dense)	(None, 100)	5100
dense_4 (Dense)	(None, 50)	5050
dense_3 (Dense)	(None, 1)	51

=====
Total params: 10501 (41.02 KB)
Trainable params: 10501 (41.02 KB)
Non-trainable params: 0 (0.00 Byte)
=====

```
R> # See how "nn2poly" class is added
R> setdiff(class(nn_reg_const), class(nn_reg))
```

```
[1] "nn2poly"
```

```
R> # Show the kind of constraint to be used, stored as an attribute
R> # When type is not specified, defaults to "l1_norm"
R> attributes(nn_reg_const)$constraint
```

```
[1] "l1_norm"
```

Due to the Python internal nature of the **keras** and **tensorflow** packages, implementing the constraints within R incurs in a slowdown of the training procedure, because of the back and




Figure 1: Training history of the neural network with constraints for the regression model.

forth at the end of each batch between Python and R to compute the constraint. Therefore, for the **tensorflow+keras** framework, the constraints have been implemented inside Python as classes `KerasCallback` and `KerasConstraint`. Now we can train the model as usual within **keras**:

```
R> compile(nn_reg_const, optimizer = optimizer_adam(),
+         loss = "mse", metrics = "mse")
R> history <- fit(nn_reg_const, train_reg_x, train_reg_y, verbose = FALSE,
+               epochs = 900, batch_size = 50, validation_split = 0.2)
R> plot(history) + ggplot2::facet_grid(~metric)
```

Figure 1 shows how the imposed constraints limit the model learning at first, with around the 200 first epochs showing a flat trend. However, after that moment, the loss function starts decreasing and the learning process converges to an optimal solution. This showcases the trade-off between learning speed and the interpretability achieved by using this constraints with our method.

As expected, the 3 (constrained) hidden layers have weights with an $l1$ -norm lower or equal than 1, while the (unconstrained) output layer does not:

```
R> # Extract the parameters in the needed manner (internal nn2poly function used)
R> params <- nn2poly:::get_parameters.keras.engine.training.Model(nn_reg_const)
R>
R> # Compute the norm of each vector in each layer
R> # These are the columns of our weight matrices.
R> weights_norms <- lapply(params$weights_list, apply, 2, pracma::Norm, 1)
R>
R> # Check which layers have weight vectors with norm >=1
R> sapply(weights_norms, function(x) all(x <= 1))
```

```
[1] TRUE TRUE TRUE FALSE
```

The process is completely equivalent for the **luz+torch** framework, with the addition of the constraints between the **setup()** and **fit** phases. The only difference is that a specific data loader is required as input (see the specific documentation for more details).

3.4. Extracting the polynomial representation

Once we have a neural network trained with the desired constraints and in an appropriate input form, obtaining the polynomial representation is done through the `nn2poly()` function. Different neural network frameworks have been explained before this point, but all of them can be used in `nn2poly()`'s argument. Hence, from this point onward, we will use the **keras** neural network to demonstrate the rest of the package's functionality.

Using the `nn2poly()` function, a polynomial of order determined by parameter `max_order` is obtained, in the same shape as explained in Section 3.1:

```
R> poly_nn <- nn2poly(nn_reg_const, max_order = 3)
R> names(poly_nn)
```

```
[1] "labels" "values"
```

```
R> rle(sapply(poly_nn$labels, length))
```

```
Run Length Encoding
```

```
lengths: int [1:3] 6 15 35
values : int [1:3] 1 2 3
```

Note that we have chosen a maximum order of 3 for the network trained on an order 2 polynomial. This approach will be useful to see if those higher-order terms converge to 0. Obviously, the needed order is not known previously in a real dataset application, but the order can always be increased if the polynomial does not predict similarly to the original network. As expected, for 5 variables, we obtain 6 terms of order 1 (intercept + 5 variables), 15 terms of order 2, and 35 terms of order 3 (combinations with repetition).

An additional feature in the `nn2poly()` function is that it can also provide all the internal polynomial representations obtained through each step from Algorithm 1 when setting `keep_layers = TRUE`, where an input polynomial and an output polynomial is obtained at each layer, with the same encoding as before:

```
R> poly_internal <- nn2poly(nn_reg_const, max_order = 3, keep_layers=TRUE)
R> str(poly_internal$layer_2, 2)
```

```
List of 2
```

```
$ input :List of 2
..$ labels:List of 56
..$ values: num [1:56, 1:100] -0.00461 0.00493 0.0025 -0.00137 -0.0069 ...
$ output:List of 2
..$ labels:List of 56
..$ values: num [1:56, 1:100] -0.00461 0.00493 0.0025 -0.00137 -0.0069 ...
```




Figure 2: Predictions from the neural network model compared with (left) the original response variable and (right) the predictions from the polynomial representation.

By the algorithm construction, the labels of the polynomial terms remain the same at each layer, with only their values changing. Therefore, the multiple polynomial representation introduced in Section 3.1 is used. In this representation, each column of the `$values` matrix represents a different polynomial—in this case, three, corresponding to the neurons present at layer 2 in `nn_keras`. These internal polynomials have the potential use of explaining specific parts of the neural network instead of only the output.

3.5. Making predictions

Obtaining predictions with the final polynomials is also possible by using the `predict()` method. Here we obtain predictions from the trained neural network as well as from our polynomial representation:

```
R> prediction_nn <- predict(nn_reg_const, x = test_reg_x, verbose = FALSE)
R> prediction_poly_nn <- predict(poly_nn, newdata = test_reg_x)
```

The polynomial predictions can be compared with the original neural network predictions to assess the equivalency in terms of predictions of the model. As it can be seen in Figure 2, the polynomial predictions obtained with `nn2poly` are almost equal to the ones obtained by the neural network. It should be noted here that we do not compare the polynomial predictions with the original response value, as the polynomial predictions should mimic the neural network independently of how well it has learnt from the original data.

3.6. Interpretation via polynomial coefficients

Outputs from `nn2poly()` can be easily visualized by using the `plot()` method:

```
R> plot(poly_nn, n = 10)
```

The original polynomial had an interaction between variables 2 and 3 ($\beta_{2,3} = 5$), which gets a strong positive coefficient in Figure 3, while the single variables appearing in the




Figure 3: Top 10 most important coefficients from the polynomial representation.

original polynomial ($\beta_1 = -2$ and $\beta_4 = 3$) have smaller coefficients with their correct sign assigned. Note that the coefficient values are not the same as in the original polynomial, as the data has been scaled to the $[-1, 1]$ interval. We can also observe that some third order interactions appear with some importance, such as $\beta_{2,3,4}$, $\beta_{1,2,3}$ or $\beta_{2,3,3}$, all of them including variables 2 and 3, and therefore capturing some of the interaction between them. In this case, the increased complexity of the data due to those interactions makes the neural network model to learn some spurious relationships, which are reflected the final obtained polynomial. Furthermore, note that higher-order coefficients would need larger values to have a meaningful impact as, again, the data has been scaled to the $[-1, 1]$ interval.

3.7. Classification example

The previous step-by-step examples were focused on solving a regression task on a given polynomial, but **nn2poly** is not limited to such case. Classification problems with neural networks mainly consist of a neural network with several outputs, where each output neuron provides a value between 0 and 1 representing the probability of the given observation belonging to each possible class. Then, the class with the highest value is assigned as the final prediction. However, those neurons compute a linear output before applying the needed activation function to transform it into a probability. Precisely, **nn2poly** can be used to obtain a polynomial representing that linear output.

To exemplify this, here we will use a neural network to classify three different species (Adelie, Chinstrap and Gentoo) of penguins based some lengths of their body parts and their weight, available in **palmerpenguins** (Horst, Hill, and Gorman 2022). Then we will use **nn2poly** to find a polynomial for each class.

First, we need to prepare the data by scaling the predictor variables to the $[-1, 1]$ interval.

```
R> penguins <- na.omit(palmerpenguins::penguins)
R>
R> # Scale the data in the [-1,1] interval and separate train and test
R> # Only the predictor variables are scaled, not the response as those will be
R> # the different classes.
```

```

R> penguins_x <- penguins[, c("bill_length_mm", "bill_depth_mm",
+                             "flipper_length_mm", "body_mass_g")]
R> maxs <- apply(penguins_x, 2, max)
R> mins <- apply(penguins_x, 2, min)
R> data_cls <- as.data.frame(scale(penguins_x,
+                                 center = mins + (maxs - mins) / 2,
+                                 scale = (maxs - mins) / 2))
R>
R> # Species need to be transformed into numbers from 0 to n_cls-1, as
R> # the keras/tensorflow is trained in Python and vectors start at 0.
R> penguins_y <- as.numeric(factor(penguins$species)) - 1
R>
R> p <- dim(penguins_x)[2]
R> n_cls <- length(unique(penguins_y))
R>
R> # Joint X and Y
R> data_cls <- cbind(data_cls, penguins_y)
R>
R> # Divide in train (0.75) and test (0.25)
R> i <- sample(1:nrow(data_cls), round(0.75 * nrow(data_cls)))
R> train_cls_x <- as.matrix(data_cls[ i, ], -(p+1))
R> train_cls_y <- as.matrix(data_cls[ i, ], (p+1))
R> test_cls_x <- as.matrix(data_cls[-i, ], -(p+1))
R> test_cls_y <- as.matrix(data_cls[-i, ], (p+1))

```

Then, we can build a **keras** neural network with 3 output neurons in this case, corresponding to the three different species of penguins present in the dataset. Note how the networks output is still linear, but we define a *sparse categorical crossentropy* loss function to work in a classification problem. Predictions will then include a *softmax* layer, but this is not needed during training.

```

R> tensorflow::set_random_seed(42)
R>
R> nn_cls <- keras_model_sequential() %>%
+   layer_dense(units = 100, activation = "tanh", input_shape = p) %>%
+   layer_dense(units = 100, activation = "tanh") %>%
+   layer_dense(units = n_cls, activation = "linear") %>%
+   add_constraints(type = "l1_norm") %>%
+   compile(loss = loss_sparse_categorical_crossentropy(from_logits = TRUE),
+           optimizer = optimizer_adam(),
+           metrics = "accuracy")
R>
R> history <- fit(nn_cls, train_cls_x, train_cls_y, verbose = FALSE,
+               epochs = 100, validation_split = 0.3)
R> plot(history) + ggplot2::facet_grid(~metric)

```

Once the network has been trained (see Figure 4 for the training history), `nn2poly()` can be




Figure 4: Training history of the neural network with constraints for the classification model.

used to transform the model into polynomials for each of the output nodes, i.e. for each of the penguin species.

```
R> # Polynomial for nn
R> poly_nn_cls <- nn2poly(nn_cls, max_order = 3)
R>
R> # Check that the number of columns in the polynomial values matrix is
R> # equal to the number of classes to predict
R> dim(poly_nn_cls$values)[2]
```

```
[1] 3
```

However, the polynomials represent the model with linear output (`nn`), but the actual classifications into the desired penguins species are provided by some probability model. Therefore, there are two options to assess the validity of the polynomials. We will first compare the linear output before converting it into probabilities, both in the network and in the obtained polynomials:

```
R> prediction_nn_linear <- predict(nn_cls, test_cls_x, verbose = FALSE)
R> prediction_poly_linear <- predict(poly_nn_cls, newdata = test_cls_x)
```

Figure 5 showcases that the linear predictions are quite similar between the neural network and the obtained polynomials. To evaluate the accuracy in the obtained classification, we need to be able to predict classes using the polynomial. We can achieve this by applying the same probability model, followed by a confusion matrix to compare the classes assigned by the neural network and the polynomial. Here, we add a *softmax* layer to convert the linear output into probabilities, and then use an *argmax* function to assign the class with the highest probability.




Figure 5: Linear predictions from the neural network model compared with the predictions from the polynomial representation for the 3 species.

```
R> # Define the model probability model and then predict
R> prediction_nn_cls <- keras_model_sequential() %>%
+   nn_cls() %>%
+   layer_activation_softmax() %>%
+   layer_lambda(k_argmax) %>%
+   predict(test_cls_x, verbose = FALSE)
R> prediction_poly_cls <- keras_model_sequential() %>%
+   layer_activation_softmax() %>%
+   layer_lambda(k_argmax) %>%
+   predict(prediction_poly_linear, verbose = FALSE)
R>
R> # NN vs original response
R> caret::confusionMatrix(
+   as.factor(prediction_nn_cls), as.factor(test_cls_y))$table
```

	Reference		
Prediction	0	1	2
0	36	0	0
1	1	18	0
2	0	0	28

```
R> # NN vs polynomial representation
R> caret::confusionMatrix(
+   as.factor(prediction_nn_cls), as.factor(prediction_poly_cls))$table
```

	Reference		
Prediction	0	1	2
0	36	0	0
1	0	19	0
2	0	0	28




Figure 6: Top 6 most important coefficients from the polynomial representation for each class.

Finally, the plot method used on the obtained `nn2poly` object allows us to visualize the top- n important coefficients in each class polynomial.

```
R> plot(poly_nn_cls, n = 6)
```

In this case (see Figure 6), it is clear that the most important coefficients are assigned to single variables, while some interactions of order 3 appear (note that, as the data is scaled to the $[-1, 1]$ interval, the coefficients of order 3 will be multiplied by three variables lower than $|1|$, which will have a lower total monomial value). In the case of Adelie and Chinstrap, variable 1 (`bill_length_mm`) is the highest absolute value coefficient, with a negative effect for Adelie and positive for Chinstrap. In the case of Gentoo, variable 2 (`bill_depth_mm`) is the one with highest (negative) effect on that class. One can also characterize each class by their coefficients: as an example, Adelie penguins will have in general, a short bill (negative variable 1, `bill_length_mm`), deeper bills (positive variable 2, `bill_depth_mm`) and with a smaller effect higher weights (positive variable 4, `body_mass_g`), while the `flipper_length_mm` does not seem to be relevant for this species (variable 3).

4. Comparison with similar frameworks

In this section, we will explore the two most complete packages in R that implement neural networks interpretability solutions, namely **Neuralsens** (Pizarroso *et al.* 2022) and **innsight** (Koenen and Baudeau 2023). As explained in Section 1.1, **NeuralNetTools** (Beck 2018), is another package in R devoted to neural network explanations, which implements visualization tools and some interpretability methods such as Olden (Olden *et al.* 2004) and Garson (Garson 1991) algorithms among others. These methods are already covered in (Pizarroso *et al.* 2022) and therefore will not be explored here for comparisons, specially as the Garson algorithm only accepts single hidden layer networks.

4.1. Package NeuralSens

NeuralSens provides neural network explanations based on performing sensitivity analysis of


neural networks using partial derivatives of the output with respect to the input. It has been implemented for several R neural network packages such as **neuralnet**, **h2o** or **caret**, but not for the deep learning frameworks used in **nn2poly**, i.e., **tensorflow** and **torch**. However, non supporter frameworks can be used as input to the main function `SensAnalysisMLP()` using the `numeric` method, which concatenates the weights of each layer in the appropriate order, with the bias at the first position. In particular, this can be done for **tensorflow** sequential models following Appendix A in (Pizarroso *et al.* 2022). Continuing with the example from Section 3.4, we will explore the explanations for the `nn_reg_const` network. Recall that the original polynomial it was trained on was $Y = 2 - 2X_1 + 5X_2X_3 + 3X_4$.

```
R> model_weights <- get_weights(nn_reg_const)
R> neural_struct <- c(nrow(model_weights[[1]]),
+                   sapply(model_weights[c(FALSE, TRUE)], nrow))
R> wts <- do.call(c, lapply(seq(2, length(model_weights), 2), function(i)
+   rbind(model_weights[[i]], model_weights[[i - 1]])))
R> # Activation functions defined manually
R> # Linear needs to be added at the start in NeuralSens notation
R> actfunc <- c("linear", "tanh", "tanh", "tanh", "linear")
```

Then, with the input in the needed form, `SensAnalysisMLP()` can be used to obtain the sensitivity analysis which can be summarized in two different plots:

```
R> library("NeuralSens")
R>
R> sens_keras <- SensAnalysisMLP(wts, trData = data_reg,
+                               mlpstr = neural_struct,
+                               coefnames = names(data_reg)[1:5],
+                               output_name = names(data_reg)[5+1],
+                               actfunc = actfunc,
+                               plot = FALSE)
R>
R> # Plots of sensitivity analysis results
R> plot(sens_keras)
R> plot(sens_keras, plotType = "features")
```

In Figure 7, the interaction effect is not easy to disentangle. The effects of non-interacting variables is well captured in the density plots (left side, bottom panels), as indicated by the high spikes for variables 5, 1 and 4. Their magnitudes are also accurately represented by the squared sensitivity (left side, center panel), with V1 being clearly negative (red) and V4 positive (green). However, the effect of the interaction between variables 2 and 3 is not easily identifiable, due to their density plots overlapping over the whole space, as it can also be seen in the right side panel. Furthermore, the magnitude of their effect (left side, center panel) is high but the sign is not clear. This example with a single interaction evidences why complex data might be difficult to explain when the interpretability method does not account for interactions. This effect can increase significantly when there are several interactions included in the original data.


Figure 7: Sensitivity analysis results from **NeuralSens**.

4.2. Package insight

Package **insight** implements several XAI techniques specific to neural networks and also other model agnostic methods. In this comparison, we will focus on some of them: LRP and Gradient \times Input as networks specific methods, and SHAP and LIME as model agnostic methods. Note that these are local interpretability methods, but **insight** provides global plots that aggregate the relevances or importance values for each variable (in absolute value) as boxplots offering a general overview of the model behavior as a whole.

In this case, **insight** directly supports sequential models from **torch**, **keras** or **neuralnet**, which all of them can be converted into **torch** models with the needed structure to be used with their explainers.

```
R> library("insight")
R>
R> # Convert the model
R> converter <- convert(nn_reg_const)
R>
R> # Apply local methods
R> result_LRP <- LRP$new(converter, test_reg_x)
R> result_grad <- Gradient$new(converter, data = test_reg_x)
R> result_SHAP <- SHAP$new(converter, data = test_reg_x, data_ref = train_reg_x)
R> result_LIME <- run_lime(converter, test_reg_x, data_ref = train_reg_x)
R>
```

Figure 8: Importance plots for the 4 methods provided by **innsight**.

```
R> # Plot a aggregated plot of all given data points in argument 'data'
R> patchwork::wrap_plots(list(
+   (plot_global(result_LRP))@grobs[[1]] + ggtitle("LRP"),
+   (plot_global(result_grad))@grobs[[1]] + ggtitle("Gradient x Input"),
+   (plot_global(result_SHAP))@grobs[[1]] + ggtitle("SHAP"),
+   (plot_global(result_LIME))@grobs[[1]] + ggtitle("LIME")),
+   ncol = 2
+ )
```

In Figure 8, the different methods provide radically different results, which indicates that at least some of them might not be well fitted to explain models trained on data with such interactions. In particular, LIME performs poorly by assigning really small coefficients to variables 2 and 3, the interacting ones, while having high values and variability in the variables appearing alone in the polynomial, i.e., 1 and 4. In the case of Gradient \times Input, variables 2 and 3 have higher variability compared to the other variables and to the previous linear example, which might be a way of detecting the presence of interacting variables. In the cases of SHAP and LRP, it does not seem easy to note that there is an interaction appearing in the model; at most, some extreme outliers appear in the boxplots for variables 2 and 3 in both cases. However, according to LRP, variable 4 has a higher relevance with respect to the other variables. In all methods, variable 5 is again correctly identified as having no effect on the output. However, all methods lack information about the sign of those importances in the global model, but this can be explored locally.

5. Conclusions

The **nn2poly** package presented in this paper supposes a novel contribution to the area of ML and AI interpretability and explainability, with the implementation of the NN2Poly method. It allows the representation of a trained feed-forward MLP neural network as a polynomial, that can be interpreted in terms of the obtained coefficients, providing therefore a explanation of the model predictions in terms of both the single variables and their interactions up to the desired order.

This method directly supports neural networks built and trained within the **tensorflow+keras** or **torch+luz** frameworks, which are the two main environments in deep learning. Furthermore, a implementation of the required constraints during neural network training is provided for both frameworks. Other neural network models can be used as long as their models can be represented as a list of weight matrices with the needed activation functions naming each matrix at each layer.

The obtained polynomial has the main use of providing interpretable coefficients for each of the original variables as well as their interactions, a feature that other interpretability methods do not always provide. This is in itself an important contribution, which can be of special interest in applied fields where explanations of the models are enforced by administrative regulations or where informed decision making is critical to the business. However, the polynomial representation has several other benefits, such as offering the possibility of inspecting the internal behavior as polynomials at each neuron and layer can be obtained, due to the iterative approach in the theoretical NN2Poly algorithm. It can also provide faster inference times if the neural network predictions are replaced by the polynomial predictions.

Future work on the **nn2poly** package may provide new functionalities such as:

- Directly support the usage of `nn2poly()` on neural network classes from other packages. This may also suppose the implementation of the needed constraints during training, however, this may not be possible for all packages if their model training is not flexible enough.
- Extend the usage of `nn2poly()` to other types of neural networks different from feed-forward MLPs, such as Convolutional Neural Networks (CNN) or Recurrent Neural Networks (RNN).
- Support for local explanations for a given observation, instead of the global model. This may allow easier comparison with other interpretability methods of local nature.

Acknowledgments

This research is part of the I+D+i projects PDC2022-133359, PID2022-137243OB-I00 and TED2021-131264B-100 funded by MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033 and European Union NextGenerationEU/PRTR. This initiative has also been partially carried out within the framework of the Recovery, Transformation and Resilience Plan funds, financed by the European Union (Next Generation) through the grant ANTICIPA.

References

- Abadi M, Agarwal A, Barham P, Brevdo E, Chen Z, Citro C, Corrado GS, Davis A, Dean J, Devin M, Ghemawat S, Goodfellow I, Harp A, Irving G, Isard M, Jia Y, Jozefowicz R, Kaiser L, Kudlur M, Levenberg J, Mane D, Monga R, Moore S, Murray D, Olah C, Schuster M, Shlens J, Steiner B, Sutskever I, Talwar K, Tucker P, Vanhoucke V, Vasudevan V, Viegas F, Vinyals O, Warden P, Wattenberg M, Wicke M, Yu Y, Zheng X (2015). “TensorFlow: Large-Scale Machine Learning on Heterogeneous Distributed Systems.”
- Allaire JJ, Kalinowski T, Falbel D, Eddelbuettel D, Tang [aut Y, cph, Golding N, , Tutorials) GIE, Posit, PBC (2024). “Tensorflow: R Interface to 'TensorFlow'”
- Amesoeuer C, Hartig F, Pichler M (2023). “cito: An R package for training neural networks using torch.” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.09599*. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2303.09599.
- Bach S, Binder A, Montavon G, Klauschen F, Müller KR, Samek W (2015). “On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation.” *PLOS ONE*, 10(7), e0130140. ISSN 1932-6203. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0130140.
- Baehrens D, Schroeter T, Harmeling S, Kawanabe M, Hansen K, Müller KR (2010). “How to Explain Individual Classification Decisions.” *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 11(61), 1803–1831. ISSN 1533-7928.
- Beck MW (2018). “NeuralNetTools: Visualization and Analysis Tools for Neural Networks.” *Journal of Statistical Software*, 85, 1–20. ISSN 1548-7660. doi:10.18637/jss.v085.i11.
- Benitez J, Castro J, Requena I (1997). “Are Artificial Neural Networks Black Boxes?” *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks*, 8(5), 1156–1164. ISSN 1045-9227, 1941-0093. doi:10.1109/72.623216.
- Biecek P (2018). “DALEX: Explainers for Complex Predictive Models in R.” *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 19(84), 1–5. URL <https://jmlr.org/papers/v19/18-416.html>.
- Biecek P, Staniak M (2021). *localModel: LIME-Based Explanations with Interpretable Inputs Based on Ceteris Paribus Profiles*. R package version 0.5, URL <https://github.com/ModelOriented/localModel>.
- Bordt S, von Luxburg U (2023). “From Shapley Values to Generalized Additive Models and Back.” In *Proceedings of The 26th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pp. 709–745. PMLR. ISSN 2640-3498.
- Chen MS, Manry M (1990). “Backpropagation Representation Theorem Using Power Series.” In *1990 IJCNN International Joint Conference on Neural Networks*, pp. 643–648 vol.1. doi:10.1109/IJCNN.1990.137643.
- Chen MS, Manry M (1993). “Conventional Modeling of the Multilayer Perceptron Using Polynomial Basis Functions.” *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks*, 4(1), 164–166. ISSN 1941-0093. doi:10.1109/72.182712.

- Chen MS, Manry M, Yeung K, Devarajan V, Bredow J, Levine D (1998). *Analysis And Design Of The Multi-Layer Perceptron Using Polynomial Basis Functions*. Ph.D. thesis, The University of Texas at Arlington.
- Cho B, Saarinen T, Sekhon J, Walter S (2023). *distillML: Model Distillation and Interpretability Methods for Machine Learning Models*. R package version 0.1.0.13, URL <https://github.com/forestry-labs/distillML>.
- Chollet F, others (2015). “Keras.”
- Chrysos GG, Moschoglou S, Bouritsas G, Deng J, Panagakis Y, Zafeiriou S (2022). “Deep Polynomial Neural Networks.” *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, **44**(8), 4021–4034. ISSN 1939-3539. doi:10.1109/TPAMI.2021.3058891.
- Collobert R, Kavukcuoglu K, Farabet C (2011). “Torch7: A Matlab-like Environment for Machine Learning.” In *BigLearn, NIPS Workshop*, CONF.
- Cybenko G (1989). “Approximation by Superpositions of a Sigmoidal Function.” *Mathematics of Control, Signals, and Systems*, **2**(4), 303–314. ISSN 0932-4194, 1435-568X. doi:10.1007/BF02551274.
- E F Haghish (2023). *shapley: Weighted Mean SHAP for Feature Selection in ML Grid and Ensemble*. R package version 0.1, <https://www.sv.uio.no/psi/english/people/academic/haghish/>, URL <https://github.com/haghish/shapley>.
- Falbel D, Luraschi J, Selivanov D, Damiani A, Regouby C, Joachimiak K, Badr HS, RStudio (2023). “Torch: Tensors and Neural Networks with ‘GPU’ Acceleration.”
- Falbel D, RStudio (2023). “Luz: Higher Level ‘API’ for ‘Torch’”
- Fan FL, Li M, Wang F, Lai R, Wang G (2023). “On Expressivity and Trainability of Quadratic Networks.” *arXiv:2110.06081*. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2110.06081. 2110.06081.
- Fritsch S, Guenther F, Wright MN (2019). *neuralnet: Training of Neural Networks*. R package version 1.44.2, URL <https://github.com/bips-hb/neuralnet>.
- Fryda T, LeDell E, Gill N, Aiello S, Fu A, Candel A, Click C, Kraljevic T, Nykodym T, Aboyoum P, Kurka M, Malohlava M, Poirier S, Wong W (2024). *h2o: R Interface for the H2O Scalable Machine Learning Platform*. R package version 3.44.0.3, URL <https://github.com/h2oai/h2o-3>.
- Garson GD (1991). “Interpreting Neural-Network Connection Weights.” *AI Expert*, **6**(4), 46–51. ISSN 0888-3785.
- González JP, Roque AMS, Gonzalo JP (2024). “NeuralSens: Sensitivity Analysis of Neural Networks.”
- Greenwell B (2024). *fastshap: Fast Approximate Shapley Values*. R package version 0.1.1, <https://bgreenwell.github.io/fastshap/>, URL <https://github.com/bgreenwell/fastshap>.

- Hornik K (1991). “Approximation Capabilities of Multilayer Feedforward Networks.” *Neural Networks*, **4**(2), 251–257. ISSN 0893-6080. doi:10.1016/0893-6080(91)90009-T.
- Hornik K, Stinchcombe M, White H (1989). “Multilayer Feedforward Networks Are Universal Approximators.” *Neural Networks*, **2**(5), 359–366. ISSN 08936080. doi:10.1016/0893-6080(89)90020-8.
- Horst A, Hill A, Gorman K (2022). *palmerpenguins: Palmer Archipelago (Antarctica) Penguin Data*. R package version 0.1.1, <https://github.com/allisonhorst/palmerpenguins>, URL <https://allisonhorst.github.io/palmerpenguins/>.
- Hvitfeldt E, Pedersen TL, Benesty M (2022). *lime: Local Interpretable Model-Agnostic Explanations*. R package version 0.5.3, URL <https://lime.data-imaginist.com>.
- Jenkins S, Nori H, Koch P, Caruana R (2023). *interpret: Fit Interpretable Machine Learning Models*. R package version 0.1.33, URL <https://github.com/interpretml/interpret>.
- Kalinowski T, Falbel D, Allaire JJ, Chollet F, RStudio, Google, Tang [ctb Y, cph, Bijl WVD, Studer M, Keydana S (2023). “Keras: R Interface to ‘Keras’”
- Knuth DE (2005). *The Art of Computer Programming*, volume 4A: Combinatorial algorithms. Addison-Wesley, Upper Saddle River, NJ. ISBN 978-0-201-85392-6 978-0-321-53496-5 978-0-201-85393-3 978-0-201-85394-0 978-0-321-33570-8 978-0-201-03804-0.
- Koenen N, Baudeu R (2023). “Innsight: Get the Insights of Your Neural Network.”
- Komisarczyk K, Kozminski P, Maksymiuk S, Biecek P (2024). *treeshap: Compute SHAP Values for Your Tree-Based Models Using the TreeSHAP Algorithm*. R package version 0.3.1, <https://github.com/ModelOriented/treeshap>, URL <https://modeloriented.github.io/treeshap/>.
- Kuhn, Max (2008). “Building Predictive Models in R Using the caret Package.” *Journal of Statistical Software*, **28**(5), 1–26. doi:10.18637/jss.v028.i05. URL <https://www.jstatsoft.org/index.php/jss/article/view/v028i05>.
- Lammers B (2020). *ANN2: Artificial Neural Networks for Anomaly Detection*. R package version 2.3.4, URL <https://github.com/bflammers/ANN2>.
- LeCun Y, Bengio Y, Hinton G (2015). “Deep Learning.” *Nature*, **521**(7553), 436–444. ISSN 1476-4687. doi:10.1038/nature14539.
- Lundberg S, Lee SI (2017). “A Unified Approach to Interpreting Model Predictions.” In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 2017-December, pp. 4766–4775.
- Maksymiuk S, Gosiewska A, Biecek P (2020). *shapper: Wrapper of Python Library shap*. R package version 0.1.3, URL <https://github.com/ModelOriented/shapper>.
- Mayer M (2024). *shapviz: SHAP Visualizations*. R package version 0.9.3, URL <https://github.com/ModelOriented/shapviz>.

- Molnar C, Bischl B, Casalicchio G (2018). “iml: An R package for Interpretable Machine Learning.” *JOSS*, **3**(26), 786. doi:10.21105/joss.00786. URL <https://joss.theoj.org/papers/10.21105/joss.00786>.
- Morala P, Cifuentes JA, Lillo RE, Ucar I (2021). “Towards a Mathematical Framework to Inform Neural Network Modelling via Polynomial Regression.” *Neural Networks*, **142**, 57–72. ISSN 08936080. doi:10.1016/j.neunet.2021.04.036.
- Morala P, Cifuentes JA, Lillo RE, Ucar I (2023). “NN2Poly: A Polynomial Representation for Deep Feed-Forward Artificial Neural Networks.” *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, pp. 1–15. ISSN 2162-237X, 2162-2388. doi:10.1109/TNNLS.2023.3330328.
- Morala P, Ucar I (2024). *nn2poly: Neural Network Weights Transformation into Polynomial Coefficients*. R package version 0.1.1, URL <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=nn2poly>.
- Nikolaidis VN (2021). “The nlib2 library and nlib2Rcpp R package for implementing neural networks.” *Journal of Open Source Software*, **6**(61), 2876. doi:10.21105/joss.02876.
- Okoli C (2023). “Statistical inference using machine learning and classical techniques based on accumulated local effects (ALE).” *arXiv*, pp. 1–30. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2310.09877. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.09877>.
- Olden JD, Joy MK, Death RG (2004). “An Accurate Comparison of Methods for Quantifying Variable Importance in Artificial Neural Networks Using Simulated Data.” *Ecological Modelling*, **178**(3), 389–397. ISSN 0304-3800. doi:10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2004.03.013.
- Ortega-Fernandez I, Sestelo M (2024). *neuralGAM: Interpretable Neural Network Based on Generalized Additive Models*. R package version 1.1.1, <https://github.com/inesortega/neuralGAM>, URL <https://inesortega.github.io/neuralGAM/>.
- Paluszynska A, Biecek P, Jiang Y (2020). *randomForestExplainer: Explaining and Visualizing Random Forests in Terms of Variable Importance*. R package version 0.10.1, URL <https://github.com/ModelOriented/randomForestExplainer>.
- Paszke A, Gross S, Massa F, Lerer A, Bradbury J, Chanan G, Killeen T, Lin Z, Gimelshein N, Antiga L, Desmaison A, Köpf A, Yang E, DeVito Z, Raison M, Tejani A, Chilamkurthy S, Steiner B, Fang L, Bai J, Chintala S (2019). “PyTorch: An Imperative Style, High-Performance Deep Learning Library.” *arXiv:1912.01703*. 1912.01703.
- Pizarroso J, Portela J, Muñoz A (2022). “NeuralSens : Sensitivity Analysis of Neural Networks.” *Journal of Statistical Software*, **102**(7). ISSN 1548-7660. doi:10.18637/jss.v102.i07.
- R Core Team (2023). *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. Vienna, Austria.
- R Zargari Marandi (2024). “ExplainerR: an R package to explain machine learning models.” *Bioinformatics advances*, **4**(1), vbae049. doi:10.1093/bioadv/vbae049.

- Rendle S (2010). “Factorization Machines.” In *2010 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining*, pp. 995–1000. ISSN 2374-8486. doi:10.1109/ICDM.2010.127.
- Ribeiro M, Singh S, Guestrin C (2016). ““Why Should i Trust You?” Explaining the Predictions of Any Classifier.” In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, volume 13-17-August-2016, pp. 1135–1144. doi:10.1145/2939672.2939778. 1602.04938.
- Sellereite N, Jullum M, Redelmeier A (2023). *shapr: Prediction Explanation with Dependence-Aware Shapley Values*. R package version 0.2.2, <https://github.com/NorskRegnesentral/shapr>, URL <https://norskregnesentral.github.io/shapr/>.
- Shrikumar A, Greenside P, Kundaje A (2019). “Learning Important Features Through Propagating Activation Differences.” *arXiv:1704.02685*. doi:10.48550/arXiv.1704.02685. 1704.02685.
- Shwartz-Ziv R, Tishby N (2017). “Opening the Black Box of Deep Neural Networks via Information.” *arXiv:1703.00810 [cs]*. 1703.00810.
- Simonyan K, Vedaldi A, Zisserman A (2014). “Deep Inside Convolutional Networks: Visualising Image Classification Models and Saliency Maps.” *arXiv:1312.6034*. doi:10.48550/arXiv.1312.6034. 1312.6034.
- Smilkov D, Thorat N, Kim B, Viégas F, Wattenberg M (2017). “SmoothGrad: Removing Noise by Adding Noise.” *arXiv:1706.03825*. doi:10.48550/arXiv.1706.03825. 1706.03825.
- Staniak M, Biecek P (2018). “Explanations of Model Predictions with live and break-Down Packages.” *The R Journal*. doi:10.32614/RJ-2018-072. URL <https://journal.r-project.org/archive/2018/RJ-2018-072/index.html>.
- Sundararajan M, Dhamdhere K, Agarwal A (2020). “The Shapley Taylor Interaction Index.” In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 9259–9268. PMLR. ISSN 2640-3498.
- Tsai CP, Yeh CK, Ravikumar P (2023). “Faith-Shap: The Faithful Shapley Interaction Index.” *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, **24**(94), 1–42. ISSN 1533-7928.

Affiliation:

Pablo Morala
Universidad Carlos III de Madrid
Department of Statistics and uc3m-santander Big Data Institute.
Calle Madrid 135, 28903 Getafe (Madrid), Spain.
E-mail: pablo.morala@uc3m.es

J. Alexandra Cifuentes

Universidad Pontificia Comillas

Department of Quantitative Methods, Faculty of Economics and Business Administration
and the Institute for Research in Technology (IIT), ICAI School of Engineering.

Calle de Alberto Aguilera 23, 28015 Madrid, Spain

E-mail: jacifuentes@comillas.edu

Rosa E. Lillo

Universidad Carlos III de Madrid

Department of Statistics and uc3m-santander Big Data Institute.

Calle Madrid 135, 28903 Getafe (Madrid), Spain.

E-mail: lillo@est-econ.uc3m.es

Iñaki Ucar

Universidad Carlos III de Madrid

Department of Statistics and uc3m-santander Big Data Institute.

Calle Madrid 135, 28903 Getafe (Madrid), Spain.

E-mail: inaki.ucar@uc3m.es