

# Multi-source Stable Variable Importance Measure via Adversarial Machine Learning

Zitao Wang<sup>1</sup>, Nian Si<sup>2</sup>, Zijian Guo<sup>3</sup>, and Molei Liu<sup>\*4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Statistics, Columbia University.

<sup>2</sup>Department of Industrial Engineering and Decision Analytics, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology.

<sup>3</sup>Department of Statistics, Rutgers University.

<sup>4</sup>Department of Biostatistics, Columbia Mailman School of Public Health.

## Abstract

As part of enhancing the interpretability of machine learning, it is of renewed interest to quantify and infer the predictive importance of certain exposure covariates. Modern scientific studies often collect data from multiple sources with distributional heterogeneity. Thus, measuring and inferring stable associations across multiple environments is crucial in reliable and generalizable decision-making. In this paper, we propose MIMAL, a novel statistical framework for **M**ulti-source stable **I**mportance **M**easure via **A**dversarial **L**earning. MIMAL measures the importance of some exposure variables by maximizing the worst-case predictive reward over the source mixture. Our framework allows various machine learning methods for confounding adjustment and exposure effect characterization. For inferential analysis, the asymptotic normality of our introduced statistic is established under a general machine learning framework that requires no stronger learning accuracy conditions than those for single source variable importance. Numerical studies with various types of data generation setups and machine learning implementation are conducted to justify the finite-sample performance of MIMAL. We also illustrate our method through a real-world study of Beijing air pollution in multiple locations.

**Keywords:** Nonparametric variable importance; Stable association; Group distributionally robust learning; General machine learning.

---

\*Email: ml4890@cumc.columbia.edu

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Background and Motivation

In scientific studies, explainability and interpretability of the regression analysis are crucial in making scientific decisions. Despite the prevalence of addressing prediction problems with modern machine learning (ML) models such as random forests, kernel machine and neural networks, the interpretability of general ML methods is an as important yet under-explored problem. To measure the nonparametric variable importance of some exposure  $X$  on some outcome  $Y$  adjusting for  $Z$ , one commonly used strategy is the so-called Leave Out COvariates (LOCO) method (Williamson et al., 2021; Tansey et al., 2022, e.g.). The main idea of LOCO is to fit two (nested) ML models separately for  $Y \sim Z$  and  $Y \sim (X, Z)$  and contrast their prediction loss characterized by certain evaluation metric such as the mean squared prediction error (MSPE). Intuitively, a large reduction on the prediction loss when including  $X$  can indicate a strong variable importance of  $X$  on  $Y$  given  $Z$ .

Nonetheless, in broad fields such as biomedical research, it is common to integrate data collected from multiple heterogeneous sources or populations for integrative regression analyses. In this situation, it is of great interest to capture important covariates displaying similar or stable effects on  $Y$  across different sources. For example, some recent genome-wide and phenome-wide association studies like Verma et al. (2024) focused on finding stable genotype-phenotype associations across different ethnicity groups or institutions. By “stable” association between  $Y$  and  $X$  (given  $Z$ ), one requires not only their dependence to exist across all sources but also the direction or pattern of  $X$ ’s effect on  $Y$  to be shared by the sources. Scientifically, such relationships tend to be more generalizable to new environments.

## 1.2 Related Works

Before introducing our main results and contributions, we shall review two lines of research that are closely relevant to our work.

**ML-agnostic variable importance.** Classic inference procedures based on parametric linear or generalized linear models suffer from their limited capacity in capturing more complex effects of  $X$  on  $Y$  as well as adjusting for high-dimensional confounders  $Z$ . In recent literature, there arises a great interest in characterizing and inferring variable importance based on general ML algorithms such as random forests or neural networks. In specific, Williamson et al. (2021) established the asymptotic normality and inference approach for the LOCO  $R^2$ -statistic constructed with general ML. Williamson et al. (2023) extended this to a more general framework accommodating generic importance assessment functions and developed semiparametric efficient estimation. Zhang and Janson (2022) addressed the inference of LOCO under the model-X framework with the knowledge of  $\mathbb{P}(X | Z)$ . To improve the power of LOCO, Williamson and Feng (2020) and others studied Shapely value as an alternative strategy less prone to high correlation among the covariates; and Verdinelli and Wasserman

(2024) further developed a decorrelated variable importance measure framework attaining better performance. However, to our best knowledge, none of existing methods in this track can be used to infer important variables holding a similar or stable relationship with  $Y$  across multi-source heterogeneous data sets.

**Group Distributionally Robust Learning.** To characterize multi-source generalizable effects, our framework will be based on an adversarial learning construction relevant to the maximin regression and group distributionally robust learning (DRoL) widely studied in recent years (Mohri et al., 2019, e.g.). With multi-source data, group DRoL aims to optimize the worst-case performance of ML models on all sources. In this framework, Sagawa et al. (2020) proposed avoiding over-fitting of over-parameterized neural networks with stronger regularization, which largely improves the worst-group accuracy. Meinshausen and Bühlmann (2015) developed a maximin regression framework to enhance the generalizability of linear models by maximizing their smallest reduced variance on multiple sources. Wang et al. (2023) extended this maximin method to accommodate general ML estimation with the least square loss. Zhang et al. (2024) derive the optimal online learning strategy and sample size for group DRoL under general models. Mo et al. (2024), Zhan et al. (2024), and other recent works aimed at fixing the over-conservative issue of group DRoL using different strategies to guide the adversarial learning procedure. Nevertheless, most existing works in group DRoL focus on its optimization and prediction, with little attention paid to statistical inference and interpretation. We note that Rothenhäusler et al. (2016) and Guo (2023) studied the inference of maximin effects in linear parametric models, which is insufficient for ML-agnostic variable importance assessment.

### 1.3 Our Results and Contributions

Despite the importance, there is a large lack of definitions for the stable variable importance shared across multiple sources, together with the related statistical inference tools. We propose a novel inferential framework for Multi-source stable variable Importance Measure via Adversarial Learning (MIMAL). In this framework, we introduce a non-parametric variable importance statistic named as MIMAL that characterizes the stable and generalizable dependence between  $Y$  and  $X$  across multiple heterogeneous populations while allowing each source to adjust for the confounding  $Z$  freely. We further convert the learning of MIMAL to an group adversarial learning task that trains a unified ML model to optimize the minimum predictive power of  $X$  (controlling for  $Z$  in baseline) across the sources, and then infer the variable importance using the fitted model. In addition, we incorporate advanced optimization tools to enable the use of complicated methods like neural networks and gradient boosting. This ensures the MIMAL framework is flexible and accommodates a wide range of ML methods as well as general variable importance criteria such as log-likelihood.

Asymptotic unbiasedness and normality are established for our empirical estimator of the MIMAL statistic, with a key assumption on the  $o(n^{-1/4})$ -convergence of the ML estimators in

the typical regression task on every single source. Interestingly, this requirement is not stronger than those used for the ML-agnostic variable importance inference on a single homogeneous population (Williamson et al., 2023, e.g.). However, our theoretical justifications are more technically involved than this track of existing work, with the main challenge and complication lying in the convergence analysis and first-order bias elimination in group adversarial learning. Numerical studies with various data types and ML architectures demonstrate good finite-sample performances of our method in terms of statistical inference.

## 2 Setup and Framework

Denote by  $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  for any positive integer  $n$ . Suppose there are  $M$  heterogeneous source populations with outcome  $Y^{(m)}$ , exposure variables  $X^{(m)} \in \mathcal{X}$ , and adjustment covariates  $Z^{(m)} \in \mathcal{Z}$  generated from the probability distribution  $\mathbb{P}_{Y|X,Z}^{(m)} \times \mathbb{P}_{X,Z}^{(m)}$  for each source  $m \in [M]$ . We use the lowercase  $(y_i^{(m)}, x_i^{(m)}, z_i^{(m)})$  for  $i \in [n_m]$  to represent the  $n_m$  observations on source  $m$  and denote by  $\mathbf{y}^{(m)}, \mathbf{X}^{(m)}, \mathbf{Z}^{(m)} = \{y_i^{(m)} : i \in [n_m]\}, \{x_i^{(m)} : i \in [n_m]\}, \{z_i^{(m)} : i \in [n_m]\}$ ,  $\mathbf{D}^{(m)} = \{\mathbf{y}^{(m)}, \mathbf{X}^{(m)}, \mathbf{Z}^{(m)}\}$ , and  $\mathbf{D} = \{\mathbf{D}^{(m)} : m \in [M]\}$ . Also, let  $\mathbb{E}^{(m)}$  and  $\widehat{\mathbb{E}}^{(m)}$  respectively denote the population expectation and sample mean operators (i.e.,  $\widehat{\mathbb{E}}^{(m)} = n_m^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_m}$ ) on source  $m$ . Let  $L^2(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Z})$  and  $L^2(\mathcal{Z})$  respectively denote the space of square-integrable functions of  $(X, Z)$  and  $Z$  with respect to all  $\mathbb{P}_{X,Z}^{(m)}$  for  $m \in [M]$ .

To model  $Y \sim (X, Z)$  on the  $m$ -th source population, we introduce an objective function  $\ell\{Y, f(X, Z) + g^{(m)}(Z)\}$  where the model  $f(\cdot) \in \mathcal{F}$  encodes the effect of  $X$  on  $Y$  (possibly interacted with  $Z$ ),  $g^{(m)}(\cdot) \in \mathcal{G}^{(m)}$  is the source-specific adjustment function of  $Z$ , and  $\ell(\cdot) : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  measures the goodness of fit of  $Y$  against the prediction model  $f(X, Z) + g^{(m)}(Z)$ . In general,  $\mathcal{F}$  and each  $\mathcal{G}^{(m)}$  can be naturally taken as  $L^2(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Z})$  and  $L^2(\mathcal{Z})$ . In later sections, we shall provide more discussions about the choice of  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathcal{G}^{(m)}$  and we assume  $0 \in \mathcal{F}$ .

For continuous outcomes, a common choice is  $\ell(y, u) = -(y - u)^2 / \sigma^2$  with  $f(X, Z) + g^{(m)}(Z)$  supposed to characterize  $\mathbb{E}[Y | X, Z]$  on source  $m$  and  $\sigma^2$  being the variance of  $Y$ . For binary  $Y$ , one can use the logistic log-likelihood  $\ell(y, u) = yu - \log(1 + e^u)$  with  $f(X, Z) + g^{(m)}(Z)$  capturing  $\text{logit}\{\mathbb{P}(Y = 1 | X, Z)\}$  or the negative hinge loss. For concrete applications, we typically impose more structural assumptions for the model  $f$ . As an example, one often simply takes  $f(X, Z) = f'(X)$  that is not dependent on  $Z$  to capture the stable effect solely from  $X$  without involving any interactions with  $Z$ . In clinical studies with  $Y$  being some disease outcome and  $Z \in \{0, 1\}$  for a treatment indication, one may take  $f(X, Z) = Zf''(X)$  with  $f''(X)$  characterizing the individual treatment effect determined by  $X$ . This could be used to decide if  $X$  is an important effect modifier.

Based on these definitions, the popular LOCO strategy (Lei et al., 2018; Tansey et al., 2022, e.g.) measures the variable importance of  $X^{(m)}$  on  $Y^{(m)}$  given  $Z^{(m)}$  in each source population  $m$  using  $I_X^{(m)} := \max_{f \in \mathcal{F}, g^{(m)} \in \mathcal{G}^{(m)}} R^{(m)}(f, g^{(m)})$ , where

$$R^{(m)}(f, g^{(m)}) = \mathbb{E}^{(m)} \ell\{Y, f(X, Z) + g^{(m)}(Z)\} - \max_{b^{(m)} \in \mathcal{G}^{(m)}} \mathbb{E}^{(m)} \ell\{Y, b^{(m)}(Z)\}. \quad (1)$$

The key idea of (1) is to contrast the predictive performance on  $Y$  between a full model including both  $X$  and  $Z$  as its predictors and a baseline model leaving out  $X$ . A larger gap between these two models  $I_X^{(m)}$  can naturally reflect the importance of  $X$  on  $Y$  given  $Z$ .

Denote by  $\mathbf{g} = \{g^{(m)} : m \in [M]\}$  and  $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}^{(1)} \times \dots \times \mathcal{G}^{(M)}$ . To measure the stable effect of  $X$  on  $Y$  across all  $M$  sources, we generalize the definition (1) by introducing a more conservative increment as:

$$R_{\min}(f, \mathbf{g}) := \min_{m \in [M]} R^{(m)}(f, g^{(m)}), \quad (2)$$

and then defining the multi-source stable variable importance statistic of  $X$  as

$$I_X^* := R(\bar{f}, \bar{\mathbf{g}}), \quad \text{where } (\bar{f}, \bar{\mathbf{g}}) \in \operatorname{argmax}_{f \in \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{g} \in \mathcal{G}} R_{\min}(f, \mathbf{g}). \quad (3)$$

The objective  $R_{\min}(f, \mathbf{g})$  characterizes *at least* how much one could gain across the  $M$  sources by including  $X$  to predict  $Y$  through the model  $f(X, Z)$ , which is quantified as the minimum (over  $m \in [M]$ ) increment of  $\mathbb{E}^{(m)} \ell\{Y, f(X, Z) + g^{(m)}(Z)\}$  over the baseline  $\max_{b^{(m)} \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbb{E}^{(m)} \ell\{Y, b^{(m)}(Z)\}$ . In this way, the maximizer  $\bar{f}$  captures a stable or consistent prediction model of  $X$  that can generalize well over all the sources, and the optimal value  $I_X^*$  measures the variable importance of  $X$  corresponding to this multi-source stable effect.

Importantly, in (2), we allow the adjusting function  $g^{(m)}$  to change freely on each source  $m$ , which accommodates the heterogeneity of the confounding effects. Also,  $g^{(m)}$  needs to be refitted in (3) and the resulting  $\bar{g}^{(m)}$  can be different from the baseline model

$$\bar{b}^{(m)} = \operatorname{argmax}_{b^{(m)} \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbb{E}^{(m)} \ell\{Y, b^{(m)}(Z)\}. \quad (4)$$

This is because that including a predictive  $X$  will typically requires a change on the adjustment function of  $Z$  to fit for the dependence between  $X$  and  $Z$ . We provide a pictorial sketch of the above-introduced model structure in Figure 1.




Figure 1: Model structure encoded in the MIMAL objective function (3).

**Remark 1.** Sometimes,  $\bar{f}$  and  $\bar{g}$  defined in (3) cannot be separately identifiable. For example,  $\bar{f} + c$  and  $\bar{g} - c$  for any constant  $c \neq 0$  is also the maximizer of  $R_{\min}(f, \mathbf{g})$  as long as they belong to  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathcal{G}$ . Nevertheless, this will not cause essential issue to our definition as both  $I_X^*$  and  $\bar{h}^{(m)}(X, Z) = \bar{f}(X, Z) + \bar{g}^{(m)}(Z)$  are still uniquely identifiable under the strict concavity Assumption 2A that tends to hold in general.

For empirical inference of  $I_X^*$ , it is sometimes helpful to achieve separate identifiability on the *estimators* of  $\bar{f}$  and  $\bar{g}$ . This is to ensure proper convergence of certain learning methods. For example, for the classic parametric regression, one could set  $g^{(m)}(Z) = \gamma_0^{(m)} + Z^\top \gamma^{(m)}$  and  $f(X, Z) = X^\top \beta + (X \otimes Z)^\top \theta$  where  $X \otimes Z$  consists of interaction terms between  $X$  and  $Z$ . In this case,  $g^{(m)}$  and  $f$  does not share any basis so they can be separately identified.

Typically, our proposed stable model  $\bar{f}$  tends to (i) be relatively conservative compared to the source-specific models as seen from the fact  $I_X^* \leq I_X^{(m)}$ ; and (ii) exclude inconsistent effects across the sources. To illustrate these points, we simulate two simple examples with linear parametric models and plot their coefficients in  $\bar{f}$  as well as the source-specific models in Figure 2; see more details in Appendix. In the left figure,  $\bar{f}$  locates in the same quadrant with more conservative effect sizes compared to the sources. In the right one, the coefficient with opposite signs across the sources is shrunk to 0 in  $\bar{f}$ .



Figure 2: Two simulated examples of our defined stable model  $\bar{f}$  in simple linear models, replicated from Meinshausen and Bühlmann (2015). The red points stand for  $\bar{f}$  and the black points represent the source-specific effects.

## 3 Method

### 3.1 Adversarial learning and inferential framework

In this section, we describe our empirical estimation and inference approach for  $I_X^*$ . To begin with, we introduce an equivalent form of the minimum reward objective function in (2) as

$$R(q, f, \mathbf{g}; \mathbf{b}) := \sum_{m=1}^M q_m [\mathbb{E}^{(m)} \ell\{Y, f(X, Z) + g^{(m)}(Z)\} - \mathbb{E}^{(m)} \ell\{Y, b^{(m)}(Z)\}], \quad (5)$$

where  $\mathbf{b} = \{b^{(m)} : m \in [M]\}$ , and  $q = (q_1, \dots, q_M)^\top$  is a set of probabilistic weights for the sources defined on the simplex  $\Delta^M$ . Noting that  $R_{\min}(f, \mathbf{g}) = \min_{q \in \Delta^M} R(q, f, \mathbf{g}; \bar{\mathbf{b}})$  where  $\bar{\mathbf{b}} = \{\bar{b}^{(m)} : m \in [M]\}$ , we have

$$I_X^* := \max_{f \in \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{g} \in \mathcal{G}} R_{\min}(f, \mathbf{g}) = \max_{f \in \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{g} \in \mathcal{G}} \min_{q \in \Delta^M} R(q, f, \mathbf{g}; \bar{\mathbf{b}}). \quad (6)$$

In this way, (3) is converted to a group adversarial learning problem on the right hand side of (6) with learners  $f$  and  $\mathbf{g}$  and adversarial weights in  $q$ . In Theorem 1, we establish an identification strategy for  $I_X^*$  as well as its corresponding arguments  $(\bar{q}, \bar{f}, \bar{\mathbf{g}})$ .

**Theorem 1.** *Assume that  $\mathbb{E}^{(m)} \ell\{Y, \cdot\}$  is concave on the function class  $L^2(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Z})$  and recall that  $\bar{\mathbf{b}}$  is as defined in (4), then the objective  $\max_{f \in \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{g} \in \mathcal{G}} \min_{q \in \Delta^M} R(q, f, \mathbf{g}; \bar{\mathbf{b}})$  has a non-negative and finite optimal value  $I_X^* = R(\bar{q}, \bar{f}, \bar{\mathbf{g}}; \bar{\mathbf{b}})$  achieved at the so-called Nash equilibrium where,*

$$\bar{q} = \operatorname{argmin}_{q \in \Delta^M} \max_{f \in \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{g} \in \mathcal{G}} R(q, f, \mathbf{g}; \bar{\mathbf{b}}), \quad \text{and} \quad (\bar{f}, \bar{\mathbf{g}}) \in \operatorname{argmax}_{f \in \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{g} \in \mathcal{G}} \min_{q \in \Delta^M} R(q, f, \mathbf{g}; \bar{\mathbf{b}}). \quad (7)$$

**Remark 2.** The maximin objective can be written in the constraint form,

$$\bar{q} = \operatorname{argmin}_{q \in \Delta^M} R(q, f_q, \mathbf{g}_q; \bar{\mathbf{b}}) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad (f_q, \mathbf{g}_q) \in \operatorname{argmax}_{f, \mathbf{g}} R(q, f, \mathbf{g}; \bar{\mathbf{b}}).$$

The constraint is a learning task to obtain the optimal prediction model  $(f, \mathbf{g})$  on the mixture of sources with any fixed set of probabilistic weights in  $q$ . Empirically, this is supposed to be realized through ML techniques. Intuitively, (7) finds the optimal adversarial weights by looking into the rewards  $R(q, f, \mathbf{g}; \bar{\mathbf{b}})$  for all  $q \in \Delta^M$  and picking the smallest one from them. Under the concavity assumption in Theorem 1, the validity of this strategy is implied by Sion's minimax theorem (Sion, 1958) that

$$\max_{f \in \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{g} \in \mathcal{G}} \min_{q \in \Delta^M} R(q, f, \mathbf{g}; \bar{\mathbf{b}}) = \min_{q \in \Delta^M} \max_{f \in \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{g} \in \mathcal{G}} R(q, f, \mathbf{g}; \bar{\mathbf{b}}).$$

There are two main advantages of transforming (3) to the group adversarial learning problem in (6), both of which can be seen from our learning algorithms to be introduced next. First, as seen from Theorem 1, we replace the discrete minimum function  $R_{\min}(f, \mathbf{g})$  with  $R(q, f, \mathbf{g}; \bar{\mathbf{b}})$  that is continuous in both  $q$  and  $(f, \mathbf{g})$  and, thus, is easier to optimize in practice with gradient-based ML methods to be introduced later. Second, as will be established in Section 4, the Nash equilibrium  $(\bar{q}, \bar{f}, \bar{\mathbf{g}})$  plays a central role in characterizing the asymptotic distribution of the empirical estimation for  $I_X^*$  so their estimations are required to facilitate statistical inference on  $I_X^*$ .

Based on the aforementioned formulation, we propose the MIMAL approach for the point and interval estimation of  $I_X^*$  outlined in Algorithm 1. It contains two regression steps including (i) learning the baseline model for  $Y^{(m)} \sim Z^{(m)}$  in each source  $m$ ; and (ii)

a sample-level group adversarial learning motivated by Theorem 1. Step (i) is a standard regression task allowing flexible use of general ML tools. Step (ii) is the empirical version of (7) and more complicated to solve. We introduce a gradient-based optimization procedure in Section 3.2 that jointly updates  $q$  and  $f, \mathbf{g}$  to attain the Nash equilibrium. It facilitates the use of a broad class of ML methods such as neural networks and gradient boosting. In both steps, we adopt  $K$ -fold cross-fitting to avoid the over-fitting bias caused by complex ML methods, which is in a similar spirit with Chernozhukov et al. (2018) and others.

---

**Algorithm 1** Outline of MIMAL.

---

**Input:** Multi-source sample observations  $\mathbf{D}^{(m)}$  for  $m \in [M]$ . Pre-specified ML model spaces  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\lambda$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_\lambda = \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_\lambda^{(1)} \times \dots \times \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_\lambda^{(M)}$  with tuning parameters in  $\lambda$ .

**for**  $m = 1, \dots, M$  **do**

Randomly split  $\mathbf{D}^{(m)}$  into  $K$  equal-sized folds  $\{\mathbf{D}_{[k]}^{(m)} : k \in [K]\}$ . Let  $\mathbf{D}_{[-k]}^{(m)} = \mathbf{D}^{(m)} \setminus \mathbf{D}_{[k]}^{(m)}$ , and  $\hat{\mathbb{E}}_{[k]}^{(m)}$  and  $\hat{\mathbb{E}}_{[-k]}^{(m)}$  be the empirical mean operators on  $\mathbf{D}_{[k]}^{(m)}$  and  $\mathbf{D}_{[-k]}^{(m)}$  respectively.

**end**

**for**  $k = 1, \dots, K$  **do**

(i) Learn the baseline models  $\hat{\mathbf{b}}_{[-k]} = \{\hat{b}_{[-k]}^{(m)} : m \in [M]\}$  where

$$\hat{b}_{[-k]}^{(m)} = \operatorname{argmax}_{b^{(m)} \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_\lambda^{(m)}} \hat{\mathbb{E}}_{[-k]}^{(m)} \ell\{Y, b^{(m)}(Z)\}.$$

(ii) Solve the maximin optimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{q}_{[-k]} &= \operatorname{argmin}_{q \in \Delta^M} \max_{f \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\lambda, \mathbf{g} \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_\lambda} \hat{R}_{[-k]}(q, f, \mathbf{g}; \hat{\mathbf{b}}_{[-k]}^{(m)}) \\ \hat{f}_{[-k]}, \hat{\mathbf{g}}_{[-k]} &\in \operatorname{argmax}_{f \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\lambda, \mathbf{g} \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_\lambda} \min_{q \in \Delta^M} \hat{R}_{[-k]}(q, f, \mathbf{g}; \hat{\mathbf{b}}_{[-k]}^{(m)}), \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where  $\hat{R}_{[-k]}(q, f, \mathbf{g}; \mathbf{b}) = \sum_{m=1}^M q_m \hat{\mathbb{E}}_{[-k]}^{(m)} [\ell\{Y, f(X, Z) + g^{(m)}(Z)\} - \ell\{Y, b^{(m)}(Z)\}]$ .

**end**

Construct the test statistic as  $\hat{I}_X = K^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \hat{I}_{X,[k]}$  where  $\hat{I}_{X,[k]} = \hat{R}_{[k]}(\hat{q}_{[-k]}, \hat{f}_{[-k]}, \hat{\mathbf{g}}_{[-k]}; \hat{\mathbf{b}}_{[-k]})$ , with its empirical standard error  $\widehat{\text{SE}}$  given in (9).

**return**  $\hat{I}_X$  and 95% confidence interval (CI):  $[\hat{I}_X - 1.96 \cdot \widehat{\text{SE}}, \hat{I}_X + 1.96 \cdot \widehat{\text{SE}}]$ .

---

Learners in Algorithm 1 are fitted from the ML spaces  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\lambda$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_\lambda$  with hyperparameters in  $\lambda$ . For example,  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\lambda = \{x^\top \beta : \|\beta\|_1 \leq \lambda\}$  stands for lasso or  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\lambda$  can be a class of neural networks with some pre-specified architecture regularized with  $\lambda$ . More examples used in our numerical studies are given in Appendix. The ML method specified with  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\lambda$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_\lambda$  are supposed to provide good estimation for the population models  $\operatorname{argmax}_{f' \in \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{g}' \in \mathcal{G}} R(q, f', \mathbf{g}'; \bar{\mathbf{b}})$  with an arbitrary source-mixture weight  $q \in \Delta^{(m)}$ ; see more details in Assumption 5.

Asymptotic unbiasedness and normality of  $\hat{I}_X$  are established in Theorem 3. Unlike



high-dimensional inference of the maximin linear coefficient studied in Guo (2023), we do not require any extra bias-correction on  $\widehat{q}_{[-k]}, \widehat{f}_{[-k]}, \widehat{g}_{[-k]}$  as the joint first derivative of  $R(q, f, \mathbf{g}; \bar{\mathbf{b}})$  automatically vanishes at its Nash equilibrium. Following Theorem 3, we estimate the asymptotic variance of  $\widehat{I}_X$  by

$$\widehat{\text{SE}}^2 = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \widehat{q}_{[-k]}^\top \text{diag} \left\{ \frac{1}{n_m} \widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{[k]}^{(m)} \left( \ell\{Y, \widehat{f}_{[-k]}(X, Z) + \widehat{g}_{[-k]}^{(m)}\} - \ell\{Y, \widehat{b}_{[-k]}^{(m)}\} \right) \right\}_{m \in [M]} \widehat{q}_{[-k]}, \quad (9)$$

where  $\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{[k]}^{(m)}(\cdot)$  is the sample variance operator on  $\mathbf{D}_{[k]}^{(m)}$  and  $\text{diag}\{\cdot\}$  represents the diagonal matrix of some vector.

**Remark 3.** The asymptotic normality of  $\widehat{I}_X$  holds only when the true  $I_X^*$  stays away from 0. When  $I_X^* = 0$  or diminishes very fast to 0,  $\widehat{I}_X$  will be degenerated just like the chi-squared test statistic; see our simulated example in Figure 6. This issue has frequently occurred in global inference literature like Guo et al. (2021). To ensure validity in the presence of such degeneration, we recommend a simple variance inflation strategy that uses an enlarged  $\widehat{\text{SE}}_\tau^2 := \widehat{\text{SE}}^2 + \tau / \min_m \{n_m\}$  to replace  $\widehat{\text{SE}}^2$  for the interval estimate in Algorithm 1, where  $\tau$  is a small and positive constant taken as 0.1 or so. This is shown to attain good numerical performance in Section 5.5.

**Remark 4.** Algorithm 1 can be naturally extended to handle the paired sampling design with  $n_1 = \dots = n_M$  and each subject  $i$  has  $M$  dependent observations  $\{(y_i^{(m)}, x_i^{(m)}, z_i^{(m)}) : m \in [M]\}$ . The Beijing air pollution data Zhang et al. (2017) set used in our real example owns such a structure that observations on each date are collected at multiple locations. In this scenario, the variable importance  $I_X^*$  is still well-defined by (6) and  $\widehat{I}_X$  obtained using the same Algorithm 1 preserves asymptotic normality. For inference, we only need to modify the empirical SE calculation in (9) as

$$\widehat{\text{SE}}^2 = \frac{1}{n_1 K} \sum_{k=1}^K \widehat{q}_{[-k]}^\top \widehat{\text{Cov}}_{[k]} \left( \left[ \ell\{Y, \widehat{f}_{[-k]}(X, Z) + \widehat{g}_{[-k]}^{(m)}\} - \ell\{Y, \widehat{b}_{[-k]}^{(m)}\} \right]_{m \in [M]} \right) \widehat{q}_{[-k]},$$

where  $\widehat{\text{Cov}}_{[k]}$  represents the empirical covariance operator on the  $k$ -th fold.

### 3.2 Gradient-Based Optimization

We now introduce optimization procedures to extract the solution  $\widehat{q}_{[-k]}, \widehat{f}_{[-k]}, \widehat{g}_{[-k]}$  of (8). A natural and commonly used generalization of gradient descent to such adversarial optimization problems is known as *gradient-descent-ascent* (GDA). At each iteration, GDA takes a gradient-descent in the ML models  $(f, \mathbf{g})$  to increase the prediction reward specified by the current adversarial weight  $q$ , as well as a gradient-ascent in  $q$  with projection onto  $\Delta^M$ , to decrease the reward with the current  $(f, \mathbf{g})$ .

---

**Algorithm 2** Two-Timescale GDA (TTUR-GDA)

---

**Require:** initialization  $(q_0, f_0, \mathbf{g}_0, \mathbf{b})$ , two step size series  $\eta_q(t)$  and  $\eta_{f,\mathbf{g}}(t)$  with different scales, and the iteration length  $T$ .

**for**  $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$  **do**

Update  $(f_t, \mathbf{g}_t) \leftarrow (f_{t-1}, \mathbf{g}_{t-1}) - \eta_{f,\mathbf{g}}(t) \nabla_{f,\mathbf{g}} \widehat{R}(q_{t-1}, f_{t-1}, \mathbf{g}_{t-1})$ .

Update  $q_t \leftarrow \mathcal{P}_{\Delta^M}(q_{t-1} + \eta_q(t) \nabla_q \widehat{R}(q_{t-1}, f_{t-1}, \mathbf{g}_{t-1}))$ , where  $\mathcal{P}_{\Delta^M}$  represents the `projsplx` step introduced in Algorithm 3.

**end for**

**return**  $(\widehat{q}, \widehat{f}, \widehat{\mathbf{g}}) = (q_T, f_T, \mathbf{g}_T)$ .

---

Traditional gradient descent ascent for adversarial machine learning suffers from limit cycling or even non-convergence. This significant optimization issue motivated the improvement of GDA with a *two-timescale update rule* (TTUR-GDA) introduced for learning Actor-Critic methods (Prasad et al., 2015) and generative adversarial networks (Heusel et al., 2017). This TTUR-GDA algorithm is used in our framework to address the adversarial learning task (8).

---

**Algorithm 3** Projection of  $y \in \mathbb{R}^M$  onto the simplex  $\Delta^M$  (`projsplx`).

---

**Require:**  $y = (y_1, \dots, y_M)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^M$ .

Sort  $y$  in ascending order as  $y_{(1)} \leq \dots \leq y_{(M)}$ , set  $i = M - 1$ .

**Step 1:** Compute  $t_i = \frac{\sum_{j=i+1}^M y_{(j)} - 1}{M - i}$ . If  $t_i \geq y_{(i)}$ , then set  $\widehat{t} = t_i$  and go to Step 3. Otherwise, decrement  $i$  by 1.

If  $i \geq 1$ , repeat Step 1; otherwise, go to Step 2.

**Step 2:** Set  $\widehat{t} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^M y_j - 1}{M}$ .

**Step 3: Return**  $x = \max(y - \widehat{t}, 0)$  as the projection of  $y$  onto  $\Delta^M$ .

---

In TTUR-GDA,  $q$  is updated using projected gradient-ascent in Algorithm 3 with its step size  $\eta_q(t)$  distinguished from  $\eta_{f,\mathbf{g}}(t)$  used for the gradient update of ML models  $(f, \mathbf{g})$ . Typically,  $\eta_q(t)$  should be chosen to dominate  $\eta_{f,\mathbf{g}}(t)$  to ensure proper convergence to a local maximin solution as shown in Lin et al. (2020), i.e. a local optimizer of  $R_{\min}$ . In our framework, TTUR-GDA allows the implementation of general ML methods with (sub-)differentiable objective functions. This includes not only parametric regression and kernel methods, but also deep neural networks and gradient-boosted tree models. In numerical studies, we implement TTUR-GDA on PyTorch with the fast and exact `projsplx` algorithm Chen and Ye (2011). For gradient-boosting, this can also be done by customizing loss functions in the libraries XGBoost and LightGBM.

## 4 Theoretical Analysis

### 4.1 Asymptotic Properties

We start from the simplified problem without the baseline covariates  $\{Z^{(m)}\}_{m \in [M]}$  and its associated effect  $\{g^{(m)}\}_{m \in [M]}$ . We will then show in Section 4.2 that the asymptotic analysis of the general case follows from this simpler case. Our population objective is now:

$$I_X^* := \max_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \min_{q \in \Delta^M} \left[ \sum_{m=1}^M q_m \mathbb{E}^{(m)}(\ell\{Y, f(X)\} - \ell\{Y, 0\}) \right]. \quad (10)$$

For simplicity, we drop the subscripts in  $[k]$  and  $[-k]$  related to cross-fitting, e.g., the solution of (8) is written as  $(\widehat{q}, \widehat{f})$  in this subsection. Also, suppose  $n := n_1 = \dots = n_M$  so we could align the multi-source samples as  $\{(Y_i^{(1)}, X_i^{(1)}), (Y_i^{(2)}, X_i^{(2)}), \dots, (Y_i^{(M)}, X_i^{(M)})\}$ , which is independent and identically distributed for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . Then we write

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{R}_n(q, f) &:= \sum_{m=1}^M q_m \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell\{y_i^{(m)}, f(x_i^{(m)})\} - \ell\{y_i^{(m)}, 0\} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{m=1}^M q_m (\ell\{y_i^{(m)}, f(x_i^{(m)})\} - \ell\{y_i^{(m)}, 0\}) \\ &:= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n q^\top \ell\{\mathbf{y}_i, f(\mathbf{x}_i)\} \quad (\ell \text{ is } M\text{-dimensional vector-valued}) \\ &:= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n F(\mathbf{y}_i, f(\mathbf{x}_i); q) := \widehat{\mathbb{E}}_n F(\mathbf{y}, f(\mathbf{x}); q). \end{aligned}$$

Let  $R(q, f)$  denote the expectation of  $F(\mathbf{Y}, f(\mathbf{X}); q)$ . The above form actually allows the data generating processes to be site-inter-dependent (albeit the joint distribution will not be a product of the marginals), thus accommodating the paired design discussed in Remark 4.

Let  $V : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be an arbitrary function, and define the directional Gâteaux derivative of  $V$  at  $f$  in the direction of  $\phi \in \mathcal{F}$ :

$$dV(f; \phi) := \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{V(f + \epsilon\phi) - V(f)}{\epsilon} = \frac{d}{d\epsilon} V(f + \epsilon\phi) \Big|_{\epsilon=0}, \quad (11)$$

then the mapping  $dV(f; \cdot)$  is again a real-valued function on  $\mathcal{F}$ . Higher order derivative are defined as  $d^{(k)}V(f; \phi) := \frac{d^{(k)}}{d\epsilon^{(k)}} V(f + \epsilon\phi) \Big|_{\epsilon=0}$ .

**Assumption 1.** *Covariates  $X^{(m)}$  from each  $m \in [M]$  is supported on a common set  $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ . There exists constant  $C > 0$  such that for every measurable set  $A \subset \mathcal{X}$ , we have  $C^{-1} < \mathbb{P}_X^{(k)}(A)/\mathbb{P}_X^{(l)}(A) < C$  for any two  $l, k \in [M]$ .*

**Assumption 2** (Restricted strict convexity). *Function  $\lambda^*(q) := \max_{f \in \mathcal{F}} R(q, f)$  is strictly convex on the simplex  $\Delta^M$ .*

**Assumption 3** (Regularity of  $\ell$ ). *The continuous function  $f \mapsto R(q, f)$  is twice Gâteaux directionally differentiable at the unique Nash equilibrium  $(\bar{q}, \bar{f})$  in all directions of  $\mathcal{F}$ .*

Assumption 1 means that the covariate distributions overlap across the sources. Assumption 2 implies that the Nash equilibrium  $(\bar{q}, \bar{f})$  is uniquely defined. This is because strict convexity of  $\lambda^*(q)$  implies uniqueness of  $\bar{q}$ , which in turn implies uniqueness of  $\operatorname{argmax}_f R(\bar{q}, f)$  by Proposition A4 in Appendix. Assumption 3 is standard and holds in general cases such as the exponential family log-likelihood.

We suppose that the second moment  $\mathbb{E}F(\mathbf{Y}, \bar{f}(\mathbf{X}); \bar{q})^2$  is finite. Fixing  $q \in \Delta^M$ , and consider the ‘marginal’ objective  $\bar{f}_{\text{ERM}}(q) := \operatorname{argmax}_{f \in \mathcal{F}} R(q, f)$ , with emphasis on the dependence of the fixed  $q$ . The  $\bar{f}_{\text{ERM}}(q)$  can be viewed as a (population) nonparametric empirical reward maximizer (ERM) on a particular  $q$ -mixture of the sources. Correspondingly, we define  $\hat{f}_{\text{ERM}}(q) = \max_{f \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_\lambda} \hat{R}_n(q, f)$  as its estimator extracted on the  $q$ -mixed source samples using ML method in Algorithm 1.

**Assumption 4** (Lipschitz implicit function). *The ERM  $\bar{f}_{\text{ERM}}(q) := \operatorname{argmax}_{f \in \mathcal{F}} R(q, f)$  is Lipschitz continuous in  $q$ . That is,  $\mathbb{E}^{(m)}[\bar{f}_{\text{ERM}}(q_1) - \bar{f}_{\text{ERM}}(q_2)]^2 \leq K\|q_1 - q_2\|_2^2$ , for some constant  $K > 0$  and all  $m \in [M]$ .*

In Proposition 1, we justify that Assumption 4 holds for the least square and logistic regressions. In general, this can be extended to other cases with smooth and regular  $\ell$ .

**Proposition 1.** *When  $\ell(y, u) = -(y - u)^2$ , the ERM  $\bar{f}_{\text{ERM}}(q)$  is Lipschitz continuous in  $q$ . When  $\ell(y, u) = yu - \log(1 + e^u)$ ,  $\bar{f}_{\text{ERM}}(q)$  is Lipschitz in  $q$  if  $\bar{f}_{\text{ERM}}(q)$  is bounded in values.*

**Assumption 5** (Minimum rate of convergence). *For every  $q \in \Delta^M$  and  $m \in [M]$ , we have  $\mathbb{E}^{(m)}[\bar{f}_{\text{ERM}}(q) - \hat{f}_{\text{ERM}}(q)]^2 \lesssim o(n^{-1/2})$ .*

Assumption 5 requires the machine learner to achieve  $o_p(n^{-1/4})$ -convergence on the ERM task on each mixture of the sources with the weights in  $q$ . The same convergence rate is required by recent ML-based inference methods for the single-source scenario (Chernozhukov et al., 2018; Williamson et al., 2023, e.g.). To help understanding Assumption 5, we establish in Proposition 2 that both the distributional sparsity and smoothness on all mixture of the sources can be inherited from the sources  $m \in [M]$  themselves. Intuitively, this means that in terms of learning on a  $q$ -mixture of the sources for  $q \in \Delta^M$ , an ML approach tends to perform as well as it is supposed to be on the sources  $m \in [M]$ .

**Proposition 2.** (I) *Suppose there exists a subset of covariates  $S$  such that  $X^{(m)} \perp Y^{(m)} \mid X_S^{(m)}$  for all  $m \in [M]$ . Then  $X \perp Y \mid X_S$  holds for  $(X, Y) \sim \sum_{m=1}^M q_m \mathbb{P}_{Y|X}^{(m)} \times \mathbb{P}_X^{(m)}$  with any  $q \in \Delta^M$ . (II) *Suppose the probability density function of  $\mathbb{P}_{Y|X}^{(m)} \times \mathbb{P}_X^{(m)}$  has an  $r$ -th derivative for all  $m \in [M]$ . Then the density function of  $\sum_{m=1}^M q_m \mathbb{P}_{Y|X}^{(m)} \times \mathbb{P}_X^{(m)}$  also has an  $r$ -th derivative for all  $q \in \Delta^M$ .**

**Remark 5.** Importantly, we do not directly impose convergence assumptions on the adversarial learning task (8), considering that it has not been studied as broadly as the ERM problem for various ML approaches. Instead, we leverage Assumption 5 to justify the joint  $o_p(n^{-1/4})$ -convergence of  $(\hat{q}, \hat{f}) = \max_{f \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\lambda} \min_{q \in \Delta^M} \hat{R}_n(q, f)$  in Lemma 2. As a benefit of this, one could further justify our Assumption 5 through comprehensive literature like Negahban et al. (2012) for Lasso, Aronszajn (1950) for kernel methods, and Bartlett et al. (2019); Farrell et al. (2021) for deep neural networks.

**Theorem 2.** *If Assumptions 1 – 5 hold and  $I_X^* > 0$ , then the fitted MIMAL variable importance  $\hat{I}_X$  is consistent with  $I_X^* = R(\bar{q}, \bar{f})$ , and satisfies that*

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{I}_X - I_X^*) \rightsquigarrow N(0, \sigma^2), \quad \text{where } \sigma^2 = \text{Var}\{R(\bar{q}, \bar{f})\},$$

and  $\rightsquigarrow$  stands for weak convergence.

More sophisticated than the ML-agnostic inference for single-source variable importance (Williamson et al., 2023), the proof of Theorem 2 relies on an important extension of the Neyman orthogonality from the ERM setting to the maximin problem. In specific, we justify the vanishing first-order influence of both  $q$  and  $f$  in  $R(\bar{q}, \bar{f})$  as shown in Lemma 1. This enables us to remove the first-order errors of  $(\hat{q}, \hat{f})$  when using cross-fitting as in Algorithm 1 or the Donsker models to be discussed in Section 4.3. Meanwhile, the second (and above) order errors of  $(\hat{q}, \hat{f})$  in  $\hat{I}_X$  are properly removed through their  $o_p(n^{-1/4})$ -convergence rate in Lemma 2 justified under the source-mixture ERM error rate Assumption 5.

**Lemma 1** (Neyman orthogonality in group adversarial learning). *Let  $(\bar{q}, \bar{f})$  be a Nash equilibrium to objective  $\max_f \min_q R(q, f)$ , and let  $(q', f')$  be an element of  $\Delta^M \times \mathcal{F}$ . Assume that  $\bar{f}$  is a stationary point of  $R(\bar{q}, f)$ , and  $q'$  has components satisfying  $q'_m > 0$  if and only if  $q_m > 0$ . If Assumption 3 holds, then the first order Gâteaux expansion of  $R(q, f)$  at  $(\bar{q}, \bar{f})$  in the direction of  $(\bar{q} - q', \bar{f} - f')$  is zero, i.e.,*

$$\left. \frac{d}{d\epsilon} R(\bar{q} + \epsilon(\bar{q} - q'), \bar{f} + \epsilon(\bar{f} - f')) \right|_{\epsilon=0} = 0.$$

**Lemma 2** (Convergence of ML in group adversarial learning). *If Assumptions 1 – 5 hold, then the MIMAL solutions converge in  $\mathbb{E}^{(m)}[\hat{f}(X) - \bar{f}(X)]^2 \lesssim o(n^{-1/2})$  and  $\|\hat{q} - \bar{q}\|_2 \lesssim o_p(n^{-1/4})$ .*

**Corollary 1** (Interval Estimation). *Suppose all assumptions in Theorem 2 hold. The empirical variance  $n\widehat{\text{SE}}^2$  defined in (9) is a consistent estimator of  $\sigma^2$  and the  $(1 - \alpha)$  confidence interval  $\text{CI}(\alpha) := [\hat{I}_X \pm \Phi^{-1}(1 - \alpha/2)\widehat{\text{SE}}]$  satisfies that  $\mathbb{P}(I_X^* \in \text{CI}(\alpha)) \rightarrow (1 - \alpha)$ .*

**Remark 6.** The asymptotic normality of  $\hat{I}_X$  lies on the uniqueness of the Nash equilibrium  $(\bar{q}, \bar{f})$ . This is guaranteed if the convexity of the function  $\lambda^*(q)$  is strict as imposed in Assumption 2. In some subtle situations such as when two sources having an identical data distribution, i.e.,  $\mathbb{P}_{Y|X}^{(m_1)} \times \mathbb{P}_X^{(m_1)} \stackrel{d}{=} \mathbb{P}_{Y|X}^{(m_2)} \times \mathbb{P}_X^{(m_2)}$ , uniqueness of  $\bar{q}$  fails to hold as  $q_{m_1}$  and  $q_{m_2}$

satisfied a linear dependency  $q_{m_1} + q_{m_2} = c$ , for some  $0 < c < 1$ , even though  $I_X^*$  and  $\bar{f}$  are still uniquely identifiable. This implies there can be uncountably many different solutions in  $\bar{q}$ . When Assumption 2 fails there is no limiting variance of the  $\widehat{I}_X$  as it depends on  $q$ . Adding a ridge penalty term on  $q$  is proposed by Guo (2023) to address this issue. In this way, the population objective becomes

$$R_\delta(q, f) := \sum_{m=1}^M q_m \mathbb{E}^{(m)}(\ell\{Y, f(X)\} - \ell\{Y, 0\}) + \delta \|q\|_2^2, \quad (12)$$

whose Nash equilibrium is unique. In our real-world study in Section 6, we take  $\delta = 0.001$  to ensure training stability.

## 4.2 Inference with Confounding Adjustment

Now we include the baseline covariates  $Z^{(m)}$  and the population objective function is as defined in (5). As discussed in Remark 1, this form raises the possibility of non-identifiability in  $(f, \mathbf{g})$ . In the following, we shall explain that this is not fatal as  $f + \mathbf{g}$  and  $I_X^*$  are generally identifiable.

Denote by  $\mathbf{h} := (h^{(1)}, \dots, h^{(M)}) \in \mathcal{H}^{(1)} \times \dots \times \mathcal{H}^{(M)} =: \mathcal{H}$  where  $\mathcal{H}^{(m)} := \{f + g^{(m)} \mid f \in \mathcal{F}, g^{(m)} \in \mathcal{G}^{(m)}\}$ . Let  $\mathcal{H}^\dagger := \{\mathbf{h} = (h^{(1)}, \dots, h^{(M)}) \in \mathcal{H} \mid \mathbf{h} = f + \mathbf{g} \text{ for } f \in \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{g} \in \mathcal{G}\}$ . The space  $\mathcal{H}^\dagger$  can be viewed as a structural subset of  $\mathcal{H}$  with its functions sharing the model  $f$  to characterize the stable effect of  $X$  and separately using  $g^{(m)}$  in each source  $m$  for confounding adjustment. Then the population objective function can be written as:

$$R(q, \mathbf{h}; \mathbf{b}) = \sum_{m=1}^M q_m [\mathbb{E}^{(m)} \ell\{Y, h^{(m)}(X, Z)\} - \mathbb{E}^{(m)} \ell\{Y, b^{(m)}(Z)\}].$$

In Lemma 3, we justify that the maximin problem constructed with  $R(q, \mathbf{h}; \mathbf{b})$  has a unique solution  $(\bar{q}, \bar{\mathbf{h}})$  under the strict concavity of  $R(q, \mathbf{h}; \mathbf{b})$  on the structural function space  $\mathcal{H}^\dagger$ .

**Lemma 3.** *Under Assumption 1A – 2A, the objective  $\max_{\mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{H}^\dagger} \min_{q \in \Delta^M} R(q, \mathbf{h}; \bar{\mathbf{b}})$  has a non-negative and finite optimal value and a unique Nash equilibrium  $(\bar{q}, \bar{\mathbf{h}})$ .*

We list the required assumptions below. Let  $\mathcal{F}$  and each  $\mathcal{G}^{(m)}$  be convex, closed and bounded. Assumptions 1A – 5A are natural extensions of Assumptions 1 – 5 to the scenario with confounding adjustment. Assumption 6A is about the ML estimation convergence rate on each baseline model  $b^{(m)}$ .

**Assumption 1A.** *Covariates  $(X^{(m)}, Z^{(m)})$  from each  $m \in [M]$  is supported on a common set  $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Z} \subset \mathbb{R}^p \times \mathbb{R}^k$ . There exists constant  $C > 0$  such that for every measurable set  $A \subset \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Z}$ , we have  $C^{-1} < \mathbb{P}_{X,Z}^{(k)}(A) / \mathbb{P}_{X,Z}^{(l)}(A) < C$  for any two  $l, k \in [M]$ .*

**Assumption 2A.** *The function  $\lambda^*(q) := \max_{\mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{H}^\dagger} R(q, \mathbf{h}; \bar{\mathbf{b}})$  is strictly convex on  $\Delta^M$ .*

**Assumption 3A.** The function  $\mathbf{h} \mapsto R(q, \mathbf{h}; \bar{\mathbf{b}})$  is twice Gâteaux directional-differentiable at the unique Nash equilibrium  $(\bar{q}, \bar{\mathbf{h}}) \in \Delta^M \times \mathcal{H}^\dagger$  in all directions of  $\Delta^M \times \mathcal{H}$ .

**Assumption 4A.** The argmax function  $\bar{\mathbf{h}}_{ERM}(q) := \operatorname{argmax}_{\mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{H}^\dagger} R(q, \mathbf{h}; \bar{\mathbf{b}})$  is Lipschitz continuous in  $q \in \Delta^M$ .

**Assumption 5A.** For each  $q \in \Delta^M$  and  $m \in [M]$ ,  $\mathbb{E}^{(m)}[\bar{h}_{ERM}^{(m)}(q) - \widehat{h}_{ERM}^{(m)}(q)]^2 \lesssim o_p(n^{-1/2})$ .

**Assumption 6A** (Baseline Models). It is satisfied that  $\mathbb{E}^{(m)}[\widehat{b}^{(m)}(Z) - \bar{b}^{(m)}(Z)]^2 \lesssim o_p(n^{-1/2})$  for each  $m \in [M]$ .

**Theorem 3.** Suppose that Assumptions 1A – 6A hold and  $I_X^* > 0$ . The fitted MIMAL variable importance  $\widehat{I}_X$  (with adjustment on  $Z$ ) is consistent with  $I_X^* = R(\bar{q}, \bar{\mathbf{h}}; \bar{\mathbf{b}}) = \max_{\mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{H}^\dagger} \min_{q \in \Delta^M} R(q, \mathbf{h}; \bar{\mathbf{b}})$  and satisfies that

$$\sqrt{n} \left( \widehat{I}_X - I_X^* \right) \rightsquigarrow N(0, \sigma^2), \quad \text{where } \sigma^2 = \operatorname{Var} \left( R(\bar{q}, \bar{\mathbf{h}}; \bar{\mathbf{b}}) \right).$$

### 4.3 Inference with Donsker Models

At last, we demonstrate with some specific examples that cross-fitting is no longer necessary when the reward  $\ell\{Y, f(X)\}$  belongs to some Donsker class indexed by  $f$  over a compact normed model space  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\lambda$ . Consider the maximin optimal value function  $\psi : C(\Delta^M \times \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\lambda) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by  $\psi(f) = \max_f \min_q R(q, f)$  for  $V \in C(\Delta^M \times \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\lambda)$ , which is Hadamard directionally differentiable at  $R \in \mathcal{K} \subset C(\Delta^M \times \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\lambda)$ , tangentially to the set  $\mathcal{K}$  of convex-concave functions of  $C(\Delta^M \times \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\lambda)$  (Shapiro et al., 2021, Theorem 7.24). Applying the function delta theorem (Shapiro et al., 2021, Theorem 7.61) on the empirical process  $\mathbb{G}_n(f) := \sqrt{n}(\mathbb{P}_n F(\mathbf{Y}, f(\mathbf{X}); q) - R(q, f))$ , asymptotic normality of maximin objective and  $\sqrt{n}$ -consistency of maximin solution follows, see (Shapiro et al., 2021, Theorem 5.10) for the Euclidean version.

**Example 1** (Parametric models). Consider the constrained parametric maximin regression:

$$\max_{\theta: \|\theta\|_r \leq \lambda} \min_q \sum_{m=1}^M \frac{1}{n_m} \sum_{i=1}^{n_m} \ell\{y_i^{(m)}, \theta^\top x_i^{(m)}\} - \ell\{y_i, 0\},$$

where  $\lambda$  is a tuning parameter and  $r$  could be set as either 1 or 2 corresponding to Lasso or ridge regression. In this case, the model class  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\lambda$  can be indexed through  $f_\theta : f \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\lambda \leftrightarrow \theta \in \Theta$  for some compact and convex  $\Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$ . Then a stochastic Lipschitz continuity assumption of  $\ell(Y^{(m)}, f_\theta(X^{(m)}))$  in  $\theta$  guarantees the Donsker condition (Van der Vaart, 2000, Example 19.7).

**Example 2** (Kernel Ridge Regression). We take  $f$  from a reproducing kernel Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_K$ , whose elements are real-valued functions on a compact subset  $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ . The RKHS is equipped with the associated kernel  $K : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined by  $K(x, y) = \langle K_x, K_y \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_K}$ , where  $K_x : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_K$  is the feature map of  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ . Suppose that the random variables  $\{X^{(m)}\}_{m \in [M]}$

are supported on  $\mathcal{X}$ , let  $\mathcal{B}_{K,C} := \{f \in \mathcal{H}_K(\mathcal{X}) \mid \|f\|_K \leq C\}$ . Then consider the sample MIMAL objective,

$$\max_{f \in \mathcal{B}_{K,C}} \min_{q \in \Delta^M} \sum_{m=1}^M \frac{q_m}{n_m} \sum_{i=1}^{n_m} [\ell\{y_i^{(m)}, f(x_i^{(m)})\} - \ell\{y_i, 0\}]$$

Invoking Sion's minimax theorem, then fixing  $q \in \Delta^M$ , the inner objective function in Lagrangian form,

$$\operatorname{argmax}_{f \in \mathcal{H}_K} \sum_{m=1}^M \frac{q_m}{n_m} \sum_{i=1}^{n_m} [\ell\{y_i^{(m)}, f(x_i^{(m)})\} - \ell\{y_i, 0\}] + \lambda \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}_K},$$

has a unique solution by the (generalized) representer lemma (Kimeldorf and Wahba, 1970; Schölkopf et al., 2001). It is  $\hat{f}(\cdot) = \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{i=1}^{n_m} \alpha_i^{(m)} K(x_i^{(m)}, \cdot)$ , a linear combination of the feature maps of the observations  $x_i^{(m)}$  for all  $m \in [M]$ . Align the samples first by the site index  $m \in [M]$  then by  $i \in [n_m]$ , with  $N = \sum_m n_m$ , define the sample  $N \times N$  kernel matrix  $\mathbf{K}$ , then the maximin kernel ridge regression objective has the formulation,

$$\max_{\alpha} \min_{q \in \Delta^M} \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{i=1}^{n_m} \frac{q_m}{n_m} (\ell\{y_i^{(m)}, \alpha^\top \mathbf{K}_i^{(m)}\} - \ell\{y_i^{(m)}, 0\}) - \lambda \alpha^\top \mathbf{K} \alpha,$$

where  $\mathbf{K}_i^{(m)}$  is the  $i$ th row of the  $n_m \times N$  row slices of  $\mathbf{K}$  corresponding to samples in site  $m$ . Note that the dimension of the coefficient  $\alpha$  for  $m \in [M]$  and  $i \in [n_m]$  increases in the sample size, and therefore cannot be indexed finite-dimensionally. Under mild condition (e.g. Gaussian kernel), the inclusion of closed ball  $i(\mathcal{B}_{K,C})$  into  $C^0(\mathcal{X})$  is universally-Donsker and compact in the sup-norm topology. Because the embedded elements are sup-norm bounded, the  $\mathbb{P}_X$ -Donsker property is also immediately transferred to the MIMAL objective function  $R(q, f)$ . See the works of Zhou (2008), Sriperumbudur (2016) and Cárcamo et al. (2024).

## 5 Simulation Studies

### 5.1 Overview

In this section, we conduct comprehensive simulation studies to investigate the asymptotic normality of  $\hat{T}_X$  and the coverage probability (CP) of the 95% CI produced by the MIMAL Algorithm 1, with various setups in the data generation mechanism and ML constructions. An overview of the simulation setups and results is given in Table 1. For all the numerical studies, the TTUR-GDA algorithm is implemented through the automatic differentiation package PyTorch in Python. Additional construction details of all our used ML models can be found in Appendix. We replicate 1000 times on each simulation setting to estimate the CP of our method.



Reward	Learner (# of Params)	Nuisance	Null-model	Coverage
$\ell_2$	Lasso (50)	No	No	94.6%
$\ell_2$	KRR (Gaussian) (1800)	Yes	No	94%
Logistic	GLM (5)	Yes	No	95.3%
Logistic	Neural Nets (57)	No	No	94%
Poisson	Cubic B-Splines (24)	Yes	No	95.0%
$\ell_2$	GLM (6)	Yes	Yes	95.9%

Table 1: A summary of simulation results. The reward functions are those based on likelihoods of Gaussian ( $\ell^2$ ), binomial (Logistic) and Poisson distribution. ‘Nuisance’ indicates whether baseline covariates  $Z^{(m)}$ ’s are included or not. ‘Null-model’ indicates whether the population truth  $I_X^*$  is 0. ‘Coverage’ is the coverage probability of our 95% CI over 1000 simulations. Experiment 3 and 5 are deferred to the Appendix.

## 5.2 Simulation 1: Lasso Regression

We generate  $M = 3$  data sources with  $n_1 = n_2 = n_3 = 800$ ,  $Y^{(m)} = X^\top \theta^{(m)} + \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ ,  $\theta^{(m)} \in \mathbb{R}^{50}$  and  $X$  is 50-dimensional uniformly distributed with independent components in the interval  $[-3, 3]$ , i.e.  $X \sim \mathcal{U}[-3, 3]^{50}$ . The  $\theta^{(m)}$  are designed to have 5 significant nonzero components, and 45 zero components, so that  $\theta^{(m)} = [\theta_1^{(m)}, \theta_2^{(m)}, \dots, \theta_5^{(m)}] + 45 * [0]$ . In specific, we set

$$\begin{aligned}\theta^{(1)} &= [5.78, -4.45, 1.26, 1.58, -1.14] + 45 * [0]; \\ \theta^{(2)} &= [2.26, -1.05, 5.78, 6.43, -1.26] + 45 * [0]; \\ \theta^{(3)} &= [1.83, -2.35, 1.34, 2.59, -6.45] + 45 * [0].\end{aligned}$$

Without  $Z^{(m)}$ , the baseline model is a null model only including the intercept term. The MIMAL objective reward function is set as  $\ell(y, u) = -(y - u)^2$ . Solution to the population maximin problem is  $\bar{q} = [0.43, 0.16, 0.41]$  and  $\bar{\theta} = [3.60, -3.04, 2.03, 2.78, -3.32] + 45 * [0]$ . To estimate the model  $f$ , we use Lasso regression with the penalty coefficient set as  $1/n_1$ .

As demonstrated in Figure 3, our estimate of  $\hat{I}_X$  shows good normality with small bias. We have 94.6% of the CI estimates to cover the true reward 135.243. In addition, we find that the mean of  $\hat{q}$  is  $[0.4321, 0.1609, 0.4071]$  and the mean of  $\hat{\theta}_{[1:5]}$  in our  $\hat{f}$  is  $[3.601, -3.042, 2.025, 2.782, -3.310]$ . Both are close to the population Nash equilibrium.

## 5.3 Simulation 2: Kernel Ridge Regression

The second simulation study implements KRR as described in Example 2. We include baseline covariates  $\{Z_m\}_{m \in [M]}$  and again consider continuous  $Y$  and  $M = 3$  sources. For each  $m$ , we generate  $n_m = n = 600$  samples of  $Y^{(m)} = X^\top \theta^{(m)} + Z^\top \gamma^{(m)} + \mathcal{N}(0, 0.25)$ , with  $X \sim \mathcal{U}[-3, 3]^3$ ,  $Z \sim \mathcal{U}[-3, 3]^2$ ,  $[\theta^{(1)}, \gamma^{(1)}] = [0.9, 0.3, 0.3] + [0.4, 0.3]$ ,  $[\theta^{(2)}, \gamma^{(2)}] = [0.3, 0.9, 0.3] + [-0.3, 0.2]$ ,




Figure 3: Empirical distribution of 1000 simulated MIMAL value in Simulation 1. The dotted vertical line indicates the true value. The horizontal red line indicates a 95%-interval estimate.

and  $[\theta^{(3)}, \gamma^{(3)}] = [0.3, 0.3, 0.9] + [0.0, 0.0]$ . The true Nash equilibrium solution is thus  $\bar{\theta} = [0.5, 0.5, 0.5]$  with  $\bar{\gamma}^{(m)} = \gamma^{(m)}$  for  $m = 1, 2, 3$ , whose MIMAL objective is approximated to 2.238.

The MIMAL objective is the usual  $\ell_2$  reward function. We use the Gaussian (RBF) kernel  $K(x_i, x_j | \sigma) = \exp(-\sigma \|x_i - x_j\|_2^2)$ , where the tuning parameter  $\sigma$  controls the ‘long-range’ dependency between the feature maps. Large value of  $\sigma$  localizes the prediction, and hence encourage training data interpolation and over-fitting. We study the asymptotic normality of our method with  $\sigma = 0.1$  as well as the bias incursion when ranging  $\sigma$  from 0.1 to 0.5. The regularization coefficient of KRR is set as  $1/(10n)$ . Similar to [Williamson et al. \(2023\)](#), we also include both cross-fitted and non-cross-fitted versions of MIMAL for comparison.

As seen from the left one of Figure 4, the empirical distribution of  $\hat{I}_X$  is normal with a mean 2.250 slightly shifted from the truth 2.238. Nonetheless, the CP of MIMAL with KRR ( $\sigma = 0.1$  and cross-fitted) is still 94% and close to the nominal level. From the right one in Figure 4, we observe that increasing  $\sigma$  to 0.3 or larger values could cause bias and under-coverage of our method. Also, the cross-fitted version of MIMAL attains significantly better coverage performance than its non-cross-fitted counterpart. For example, when  $\sigma = 0.4$ , cross-fitted MIMAL attains a 90% CP while the non-cross-fitted one only has it around 80%. This demonstrates the effectiveness of cross-fitting in reducing over-fitting bias when using high-complexity ML models in our framework.

## 5.4 Simulation 3: Neural Network Classification

The simulation runs on a data-generating mechanism taking  $M = 3$ ,  $n_1 = n_2 = n_3 = 700$ , and  $Y^{(m)} \sim \text{Binomial}(700, p^{(m)})$  with the nonlinear generating process  $p^{(m)} = \sigma((X_1^3, X_2^3, X_3^3)^\top \theta^{(m)})$




Figure 4: Left figure: Empirical distribution of 1000 simulated MIMAL value in Simulation 2 with cross-fitted KRR ( $\sigma = 0.1$ ). The dotted vertical line indicates the true value. The horizontal red line indicates a 95%-interval estimate. Right figure: Coverage probability with varying values of the tuning parameter  $\sigma$  in cross-fitted and non-cross-fitted versions of MIMAL.

where  $X^\top \sim \mathcal{U}[-2, 2]^3$ , and  $\theta^{(m)}$  permutes the vector  $[0.2, 0.6, 0.6]$ . For ML modeling of  $f$ , we use a fully connected feed-forward neural network learner with the layer structure set as:

```
nn.Linear(3,6), nn.ReLU(),
nn.Linear(6,4), nn.ReLU(),
nn.Linear(4,1), nn.Sigmoid(),
```

which includes totally 57 parameters, the activation function  $\text{ReLU}(x) = \max(0, x) =: x^+$ , and the output layer  $\sigma(x) = 1/(1 + e^{-x})$ . The optimization Algorithm 2 has a fixed initialization of the layers. The simulated values center well around the (large-sample-simulated) true population Nash equilibrium. At most times of the simulations, the learners well-converge to the global Nash equilibrium, while in a few cases the algorithm can only find local solutions. The asymptotic unbiasedness and normality of the resulting  $\hat{I}_X$  is well-preserved as shown in Figure 5 and the CP of MIMAL achieves 94%.

## 5.5 Simulation 4: Linear Regression Null Model

We design an experiment where the true population MIMAL objective is zero. We simply consider  $M = 2$  sources with  $n_1 = n_2 = 2000$  and the data generated from  $Y^{(m)} = X^\top \theta^{(m)} + Z^\top \gamma^{(m)} + \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$  and  $(X^\top, Z^\top) \sim \mathcal{U}[-3, 3]^5$ . In particular, the parameters are

$$\begin{aligned} [\theta^{(1)}, \gamma^{(1)}] &= [1, 1, 1, 1] + [0.4, 0.3] \\ [\theta^{(2)}, \gamma^{(2)}] &= -\theta^{(1)} + [-0.3, 0.2]. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\theta^{(1)}$  and  $\theta^{(2)}$  has the same magnitudes and opposite signs, one can show that the linear model maximin solution is  $\theta^* = [0, 0, 0, 0]$  and the population MIMAL value  $I_X^*$  is zero. In this case, as discussed in Remark 3, the distribution of  $\hat{I}_X$  tends to converge to a non-normal




Figure 5: Empirical distribution of 1000 simulated MIMAL value in Simulation 3. The dotted vertical line indicates the true value. The horizontal red line indicates a 95%-interval estimate.

distribution super-efficiently, i.e., faster than  $O_p(n^{-1/2})$ . This non-normality is demonstrated through the simulated distribution of  $\hat{I}_X$  in Figure 6, with  $\hat{\theta}$ ,  $\hat{\gamma}^{(1)}$ , and  $\hat{\gamma}^{(2)}$  being unbiased.

For interval estimate, we employ the variance-inflation methods described in Remark 3 with  $\tau = 0.1$  or  $0.2$ . The coverage probability turns out to be 95.9% and 97.9% respectively for  $\tau = 0.1$  and  $0.2$ . An under-coverage of 84.4% happens without any variance inflation i.e.  $\tau = 0$ , which is expected from the non-normality and super-efficiency of  $\hat{I}_X$  when  $I_X^* = 0$ .

## 6 Real-Data Analysis: Beijing Air Pollution

In atmospheric science, the term *particulate matter* (PM) stands for microscopic particles of solid or liquid matter suspended in the air. In particular,  $PM_{2.5}$  refers to fine PM that consists of particles in the air that are 2.5 micrometers in diameter or less. In an effort to analyze reduction of Beijing  $PM_{2.5}$  concentration, Zhang et al. (2017) studied a nonparametric spatial-temporal modelling of Beijing  $PM_{2.5}$  concentration assisted by covariates of meteorological measurements. The data catalogued hourly measurements of  $PM_{2.5}$  from 2013 to 2016 monitored by 12 state-controlled (GuoKong) monitoring sites in Beijing. The measurements are accompanied by 6 meteorological variables. Five of which are numerical: air temperature (TEMP), dew point (DEWP), air pressure (PRES), precipitation (RAIN) and wind speed (WSPM). One of which is categorical: wind direction (WD). The categorical variable WD is transformed to a four dimensional indicator vector according to the four directions [N, E, S, W], for instance NE  $\mapsto [1, 1, 0, 0] \in \{0, 1\}^4$ . We then concatenate WD and WSPM into a single group of factors to represent the wind condition (WC).

All variables are collected in  $M = 3$  geographically distant monitoring sites including Aoti, Changping and Shunyi. The data has a natural paired structure as introduced in Remark 4




Figure 6: Empirical distribution of 1000 simulated MIMAL value in Simulation 4, against a truncated normal density plot with the simulated sample mean and sample standard deviation. The true  $I_X^* = 0$  in this case.

that all the hourly measurements are aligned according to the time point across the three sources. We randomly sample  $n_1 = n_2 = n_3 = 700$  observations (time points) among the four months from November, 2013 to February, 2014. We conduct two MIMAL analyses separately using parametric models and KRR, to infer the variable importance of each covariate  $X$  on the  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  outcome  $Y$  in adjustment for the remaining covariates  $Z$ , in a similar spirit with the LOCO strategy. Since  $Y$  is continuous, we take  $\ell(y, u) = -(y - u)^2$ . For parametric regression, we form the interaction basis  $\mathbf{X}_{\text{inter}} = [XZ_1, \dots, XZ_{\dim(Z)}]$  and set

$$f(X, Z) = \theta_0 X + \mathbf{X}_{\text{inter}}^\top \theta; \quad g^{(m)}(Z) = \gamma_0^{(m)} + Z^\top \gamma^{(m)}.$$

For KRR, we use the RBF kernel as in Section 5.3 with  $\sigma = 0.2$ , and the penalty coefficient set as  $1/n_1$ . In addition, to ensure training stability, we introduce a small ridge regularization on  $q$  as described in Remark 6 with the penalty coefficient  $\delta = 0.001$ .

The resulting 95% CIs for  $I_X^*$  and each source-specific variable importance  $I_X^{(m)}$  as well as the fitted  $\hat{q}$  for the predictors are presented in Figures 7 and 8, respectively for the parametric and KRR constructions. DEWP stands out as the most important predictor for  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  across the three sources, with an  $[0.22, 0.35]$  CI for  $I_X^*$  using parametric regression and an  $[0.25, 0.37]$  CI using KRR. This agrees with the conclusion in recent scientific literature (Chen et al., 2020, e.g.) that humidity (dew point) has the most dominant effect on  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  particle formation in the atmosphere. Air temperature (TEMP) and the group of wind condition variables (WC) also have their importance variable on  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  significantly larger than 0 with both learning methods. Differently, precipitation (RAIN) and air pressure (PRES) only show a moderately significant  $I_X^*$  when using KRR but have their CIs covering 0 with parametric regressions.




Figure 7: *MIMAL with parametric regression*. Left figure: 95% CIs of the MIMAL variable importance for every predictor learned by parametric regression. Right figure: Fitted  $q$ -component in the MIMAL Nash equilibrium.




Figure 8: *MIMAL with KRR*. Left figure: 95% CIs of the MIMAL variable importance for every predictor learned by KRR. Right figure: Fitted  $q$ -component in the MIMAL Nash equilibrium.

Due to the small ridge penalty on  $q$ , the fitted  $I_X^*$ 's are not rigorously smaller than the smallest  $I_X^{(m)}$  as its original population version is supposed to be. Nevertheless, we still observe that MIMAL produces a more conservative variable importance measure than most sources, as discussed in Section 2. In addition, the variable importance estimated using KRR is moderately larger in values than their parametric model counterparts. This is because KRR is more capable of capturing non-linear relationships and could explain more variance of  $Y$  with  $X$ .

## 7 Discussion

**Transfer learning under covariate shift.** The importance measure  $I_X^*$  usually depends on the marginal distribution of  $(X, Z)$ . In (6), the source populations are combined jointly in

the distributions of  $(X, Z)$  and  $Y | X, Z$ . In transfer learning, we could be more interested in quantifying the predictive importance of  $X$  on some target population  $\mathbb{Q}_{X,Z}$  that is different from the sources  $\mathbb{P}_{X,Z}^{(m)}$ 's. Meanwhile, in the target data, we only have samples of  $(X, Z)$  without any observations of  $Y$ , which calls for knowledge transfer of the outcome models  $\mathbb{P}_{Y|X,Z}^{(m)}$ 's from the  $M$  sources to the target. This is known as the covariate shift problem frequently studied in recent literature (Gretton et al., 2009, e.g.). In this scenario, it is natural to extend the reward defined in (1) as

$$R_{\mathbb{Q}}^{(m)}(f, g^{(m)}) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{(m)} \ell\{Y, f(X, Z) + g^{(m)}(Z)\} - \max_{b^{(m)} \in \mathcal{G}^{(m)}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{(m)} \ell\{Y, b^{(m)}(Z)\},$$

where  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{(m)} := \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}_{X,Z} \times \mathbb{P}_{Y|X,Z}^{(m)}}$  operates on a counterfactual population with  $(X, Z) \sim \mathbb{Q}_{X,Z}$  and  $Y | X, Z \sim \mathbb{P}_{Y|X,Z}^{(m)}$ . Then the minimum increment  $R_{\min}$  in (2) as well as  $I_X^*$  can be modified correspondingly by replacing  $R^{(m)}$  with  $R_{\mathbb{Q}}^{(m)}$ . To estimate  $I_X^*$  in this transfer learning setting, one could use importance weighting that corrects for the covariate shift by re-weighting the sample on each source  $m$  with the density ratio between  $\mathbb{Q}_{X,Z}$  and  $\mathbb{P}_{X,Z}^{(m)}$ . Furthermore, the doubly robust framework of Liu et al. (2023) can be potentially incorporated to provide more robust and efficient inference.

**Non-uniqueness of  $\bar{q}$ .** As discussed in Remark 6, the strict convexity Assumption 2 is made to ensure the uniqueness of  $\bar{q}$  in the Nash equilibrium, which is necessary for the normality of  $\hat{I}_X$  and commonly used in group DRoL literature (Wang et al., 2023, e.g.). Adding a ridge penalty on  $q$  as in (12) is a convenient way to fix this issue in practice but incurs an undesirable change to the objective function. A future direction is to maintain valid inference with potentially non-normal  $\hat{I}_X$  obtained from the original objective without any regularization on  $q$ .

**Optimization.** We notice that a CVX extension on Disciplined Saddle Programming (dsp) (Schiele et al., 2024) was published based on the work of Juditsky and Nemirovski (2022), which could make it more convenient to implement MIMAL with user-specified objective functions and models. To make our framework more user-friendly and flexible, it is also desirable to incorporate other ML methods like random forest and  $k$ -nearest neighbours. Nevertheless, such extensions are not straightforward for those non-gradient-based learning algorithms.

## Acknowledgement

The authors would like to thank Bharath Sriperumbudur (Penn State University) for helpful discussion on compact embedding of RKHS.

## References

- Aronszajn, N. (1950). Theory of reproducing kernels. *Transactions of the American mathematical society*, 68(3):337–404.
- Bartlett, P. L., Harvey, N., Liaw, C., and Mehrabian, A. (2019). Nearly-tight vc-dimension and pseudodimension bounds for piecewise linear neural networks. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 20(63):1–17.
- Cárcamo, J., Cuevas, A., and Rodríguez, L.-A. (2024). A uniform kernel trick for high and infinite-dimensional two-sample problems. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 202:105317.
- Chen, Y. and Ye, X. (2011). Projection onto a simplex. *arXiv: 1101.6081*.
- Chen, Z., Chen, D., Zhao, C., po Kwan, M., Cai, J., Zhuang, Y., Zhao, B., Wang, X., Chen, B., Yang, J., Li, R., He, B., Gao, B., Wang, K., and Xu, B. (2020). Influence of meteorological conditions on pm2.5 concentrations across china: A review of methodology and mechanism. *Environment International*, 139:105558.
- Chernozhukov, V., Chetverikov, D., Demirer, M., Duflo, E., Hansen, C., Newey, W., and Robins, J. (2018). Double/debiased machine learning for treatment and structural parameters. *The Econometrics Journal*, 21(1):C1–C68.
- Farrell, M. H., Liang, T., and Misra, S. (2021). Deep neural networks for estimation and inference. *Econometrica*, 89(1):181–213.
- Gretton, A., Smola, A., Huang, J., Schmittfull, M., Borgwardt, K., and Schölkopf, B. (2009). Covariate shift by kernel mean matching. *Dataset shift in machine learning*, 3(4):5.
- Guo, Z. (2023). Statistical inference for maximin effects: Identifying stable associations across multiple studies. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 0(0):1–17.
- Guo, Z., Renaux, C., Bühlmann, P., and Cai, T. (2021). Group inference in high dimensions with applications to hierarchical testing. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 15(2):6633–6676.
- Heusel, M., Ramsauer, H., Unterthiner, T., Nessler, B., and Hochreiter, S. (2017). Gans trained by a two time-scale update rule converge to a local nash equilibrium. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30.
- Juditsky, A. and Nemirovski, A. (2022). On well-structured convex-concave saddle point problems and variational inequalities with monotone operators. *Optimization Methods and Software*, 37(5):1567–1602.
- Kimeldorf, G. S. and Wahba, G. (1970). A correspondence between bayesian estimation on stochastic processes and smoothing by splines. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 41(2):495–502.



- Lei, J., G’Sell, M., Rinaldo, A., Tibshirani, R. J., and Wasserman, L. (2018). Distribution-free predictive inference for regression. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 113(523):1094–1111.
- Lin, T., Jin, C., and Jordan, M. (2020). On gradient descent ascent for nonconvex-concave minimax problems. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR.
- Liu, M., Zhang, Y., Liao, K. P., and Cai, T. (2023). Augmented transfer regression learning with semi-non-parametric nuisance models. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 24(293):1–50.
- Meinshausen, N. and Bühlmann, P. (2015). Maximin effects in inhomogeneous large-scale data. *The Annals of Statistics*, 43(4):1801–1830.
- Mo, W., Tang, W., Xue, S., Liu, Y., and Zhu, J. (2024). Minimax regret learning for data with heterogeneous subgroups. *arXiv: 2405.01709*.
- Mohri, M., Sivek, G., and Suresh, A. T. (2019). Agnostic federated learning. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 4615–4625. PMLR.
- Negahban, S. N., Ravikumar, P., Wainwright, M. J., Yu, B., et al. (2012). A unified framework for high-dimensional analysis of  $m$ -estimators with decomposable regularizers. *Statistical Science*, 27(4):538–557.
- Prasad, H. L., Prashanth, L. A., and Bhatnagar, S. (2015). Two-timescale algorithms for learning nash equilibria in general-sum stochastic games. In *Proceedings of the 2015 International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems (AAMAS ’15)*, pages 1371–1379.
- Rothenhäusler, D., Meinshausen, N., and Bühlmann, P. (2016). Confidence intervals for maximin effects in inhomogeneous large-scale data. In *Statistical Analysis for High-Dimensional Data*, pages 255–277, Cham. Springer International Publishing.
- Sagawa, S., Koh, P. W., Hashimoto, T. B., and Liang, P. (2020). Distributionally robust neural networks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Schiele, P., Luxenberg, E., and Boyd, S. (2024). Disciplined saddle programming. *arXiv: 2301.13427*.
- Schölkopf, B., Herbrich, R., and Smola, A. J. (2001). A generalized representer theorem. In Helmbold, D. and Williamson, B., editors, *Computational Learning Theory*, pages 416–426, Berlin, Heidelberg. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

- Shapiro, A., Dentcheva, D., and Ruszczyński, A. (2021). *Lectures on Stochastic Programming: Modeling and Theory, Third Edition*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia, PA.
- Sion, M. (1958). On general minimax theorems. *Pacific Journal of Mathematics*, 8(1):171–176.
- Sriperumbudur, B. (2016). On the optimal estimation of probability measures in weak and strong topologies. *Bernoulli*, 22(3):1839–1893.
- Tansey, W., Veitch, V., Zhang, H., Rabadan, R., and Blei, D. M. (2022). The holdout randomization test for feature selection in black box models. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 31(1):151–162.
- Van der Vaart, A. W. (2000). *Asymptotic statistics*, volume 3. Cambridge university press.
- Verdinelli, I. and Wasserman, L. (2024). Decorrelated variable importance. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 25(7):1–27.
- Verma, A., Huffman, J. E., Rodriguez, A., Conery, M., Liu, M., Ho, Y.-L., Kim, Y., Heise, D. A., Guare, L., Panickan, V. A., et al. (2024). Diversity and scale: Genetic architecture of 2068 traits in the va million veteran program. *Science*, 385(6706):eadj1182.
- Wang, Z., Bühlmann, P., and Guo, Z. (2023). Distributionally robust machine learning with multi-source data. *arXiv: 2309.02211*.
- Williamson, B. and Feng, J. (2020). Efficient nonparametric statistical inference on population feature importance using shapley values. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 10282–10291. PMLR.
- Williamson, B., Gilbert, P., Carone, M., and Simon, N. (2021). Nonparametric variable importance assessment using machine learning techniques. *Biometrics*, 77(1):9–22. Epub 2020 Dec 8.
- Williamson, B., Gilbert, P., Simon, N., and Carone, M. (2023). A general framework for inference on algorithm-agnostic variable importance. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 118(543):1645–1658. PMID: 37982008.
- Zhan, K., Xiong, X., Guo, Z., Cai, T., and Liu, M. (2024). Transfer learning targeting mixed population: A distributional robust perspective. *arXiv: 2407.20073*.
- Zhang, L. and Janson, L. (2022). Floodgate: Inference for model-free variable importance. *arXiv: 2007.01283*.
- Zhang, S., Guo, B., Dong, A., He, J., Xu, Z., and Chen, S. X. (2017). Cautionary tales on air-quality improvement in beijing. *Proceedings of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 473(2206):20170457.

Zhang, Z., Zhan, W., Chen, Y., Du, S. S., and Lee, J. D. (2024). Optimal multi-distribution learning. In *The Thirty Seventh Annual Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 5220–5223. PMLR.

Zhou, D.-X. (2008). Derivative reproducing properties for kernel methods in learning theory. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, 220(1):456–463.