

Assessing high-order effects in feature importance via predictability decomposition

Marlis Ontivero-Ortega¹, Luca Faes², Jesus M Cortes³,
Daniele Marinazzo⁴, and Sebastiano Stramaglia¹

¹ *Dipartimento Interateneo di Fisica,
Università degli Studi di Bari Aldo Moro,
and INFN, Sezione di Bari,
70126 Bari, Italy*

² *Dipartimento di Ingegneria,
Università di Palermo,
90128, Palermo, Italy
Faculty of Technical Sciences,
University of Novi Sad, Serbia*

³ *Biocruces-Bizkaia Health Research Institute,
Barakaldo, Spain
Biomedical Research Doctorate Program,
University of the Basque Country, Leioa, Spain
Department of Cell Biology and Histology,
University of the Basque Country, Leioa, Spain
IKERBASQUE Basque Foundation for Science,
Bilbao, Spain
and*

⁴ *Department of Data Analysis,
Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium*

(Dated: December 16, 2024)

Abstract

Leveraging the large body of work devoted in recent years to describe redundancy and synergy in multivariate interactions among random variables, we propose a novel approach to quantify cooperative effects in feature importance, one of the most used techniques for explainable artificial intelligence. In particular, we propose an adaptive version of a well-known metric of feature importance, named Leave One Covariate Out (LOCO), to disentangle high-order effects involving a given input feature in regression problems. LOCO is the reduction of the prediction error when the feature under consideration is added to the set of all the features used for regression. Instead of calculating the LOCO using all the features at hand, as in its standard version, our method searches for the multiplet of features that maximize LOCO and for the one that minimize it. This provides a decomposition of the LOCO as the sum of a two-body component and higher-order components (redundant and synergistic), also highlighting the features that contribute to building these high-order effects alongside the driving feature. We report the application to proton/pion discrimination from simulated detector measures by GEANT.

In explainable artificial intelligence (XAI) [1], global feature importance methods [2] determine how much each individual feature contributes to predicting the target variable, resulting in one importance score for each feature. Among the most used metrics of feature importance is the Leave One Covariate Out (LOCO) [3], i.e. the reduction of the prediction error when the feature under consideration is added to the set of all the features used for regression. However, predicting the target variable often requires including interactions among several features. Moreover input features may be highly correlated with other features: conflating cooperative effects in just one score for each feature might lead to misinterpretations. In this work, we propose a new decomposition of feature importance scores that disentangles three components: the unique pure (two-body) influence of the feature on the target, and the contributions stemming from synergistic and redundant interactions with other features.

Our approach exploits recent results which generalize the traditional dyadic description of networks of variables to the higher-order setting [4, 5], with an increasing attention devoted to the emergent properties of complex systems, manifesting through high-order behaviors sought in observed data. A key framework in this literature is the partial information decomposition (PID) [6] and its subsequent developments [7], which utilize information-theoretic tools to reveal high-order dependencies among groups of three or more variables and describe their synergistic or redundant nature. Within this framework, redundancy refers to information retrievable from multiple sources, while synergy refers to information retrievable from the whole system that cannot be observed in its individual parts. Notably, in some papers the use of predictability (from linear modeling of data) has also been proposed to highlight high-order effects [8–10]: using reduction in variance instead of entropy, the effect due to a group of independent variables is equal to the sum of effects from the individual variables (assuming linearity), see the related discussion in [11].

The main idea behind the present approach is that the gain in predictability due to the inclusion of a given variable can be measured either by conditional mutual information, in terms of reduction of entropy, or by LOCO in terms of reduction of error variance: in other words, they are different measures of the same effect, the first rooted in information theory and the second rooted in regression. It follows that replacing the conditional mutual information with the LOCO leads to new approaches for using synergy and redundancy in the realm of regression theory.

Recently a decomposition of the transfer entropy [12] (the major approach to evaluate

the *reduction in surprise* between random processes) into unique, redundant, and synergistic atoms, has been proposed [13], enabling the quantification of the relative importance of high-order effects compared to pure two-body effects in information transfer between two processes, and highlighting the processes that contribute to building these high-order effects alongside the driver. Replacing the conditional mutual information with LOCO in the framework developed in [13] yields a decomposition of LOCO in unique, redundant and synergistic atoms, achieving the sought decomposition of feature importance. Since the decomposition is obtained replacing entropy with variance, it leads to an alternative definition of synergy and redundancy, rooted in regression, avoiding the distorting effect when comparing combined information from two independent sources with the sum of information from each source on its own, due to the concavity of the logarithm function, at the price of losing the robust formalism of information theory [11]. Clearly, the proposed decomposition also depends on the choice of the hypothesis space for regression; conditional mutual information is strongly dependent on the choice of the approximate method used for its estimate. In the following, we describe in detail the proposed methodology.

Let us consider n stochastic variables $\mathbf{Z} = \{z_\alpha\}_{\alpha=1,\dots,n}$, a driver variable X and a target variable Y . Let $\epsilon(Y|X, \mathbf{Z})$ be the mean squared prediction error [14] of Y on the basis of all input variables at hand, X and \mathbf{Z} (corresponding to linear regression or any non-linear regression model). Now, consider $\epsilon(Y|\mathbf{Z})$, the prediction error of Y on the basis of only the \mathbf{Z} variables, , then the difference of errors in the two conditions

$$L_{\mathbf{Z}}(X \rightarrow Y) = \epsilon(Y|\mathbf{Z}) - \epsilon(Y|X, \mathbf{Z}) \quad (1)$$

is the well known measure of feature importance *Leave One Covariate Out* (LOCO) [3], which is non negative for a large class of predictors [15]. Equation (1) amounts to quantify the drop in predictive power when removing feature X from the regression model; hence $L_{\mathbf{Z}}(X \rightarrow Y)$ does the same job, using predictability, as the conditional mutual information $I(X; Y|\mathbf{Z})$ for the corresponding reduction of entropy. As a consequence, substituting $I(X; Y|\mathbf{Z})$ with $L_{\mathbf{Z}}(X \rightarrow Y)$ in information theoretical approaches for high-order dependencies leads to an alternative definition of synergy which can be interpreted in terms of predictability/regression. With the same notation, the reduction of error variance using only the driver X (the *pairwise* predictive power, or explained variance) will be denoted by $L_{\emptyset}(X \rightarrow Y) = \sigma_Y^2 - \epsilon(Y|X)$. Now, $L_{\emptyset}(X \rightarrow Y)$ may be either greater or smaller than

$L_{\mathbf{Z}}(X \rightarrow Y)$. The case $L_{\emptyset}(X \rightarrow Y) > L_{\mathbf{Z}}(X \rightarrow Y)$ corresponds to redundancy among the three variables X , \mathbf{Z} and Y , whilst $L_{\emptyset}(X \rightarrow Y) < L_{\mathbf{Z}}(X \rightarrow Y)$ corresponds to synergy. According to the discussion in [13], $L_{\mathbf{Z}}(X \rightarrow Y)$ underestimates the importance of X when X is redundant with some of the variables of \mathbf{Z} . Moreover, considering just the driver X , i.e. $L_{\emptyset}(X \rightarrow Y)$, neglects synergies between x and \mathbf{Z} , in other words it neglects suppressor variables [16] in \mathbf{Z} which may enhance the predictability of Y on the basis of X .

Considering now just a subset \mathbf{z} of all the variables in \mathbf{Z} , it is intuitive that searching for \mathbf{z}_{\min} minimizing $L_{\mathbf{z}}(X \rightarrow Y)$ captures the amount of redundancy R that the rest of variables share with the pair $X - Y$, i.e. we may define $R = L_{\emptyset}(X \rightarrow Y) - L_{\mathbf{z}_{\min}}(X \rightarrow Y)$. The unique predictive power U , i.e. the pure two-body influence of X on Y , will be given by $U = L_{\mathbf{z}_{\min}}(X \rightarrow Y)$. On the other hand, searching for \mathbf{z}_{\max} maximizing $L_{\mathbf{z}}(X \rightarrow Y)$, leads to the amount of synergy S that the *remaining variables* provide in terms of the increase of predictability: $S = L_{\mathbf{z}_{\max}}(X \rightarrow Y) - L_{\emptyset}(X \rightarrow Y)$.

It follows that:

$$L_{\mathbf{z}_{\max}}(X \rightarrow Y) = S + R + U, \quad (2)$$

and the maximal predictive power of X to Y can be decomposed into the sum of a unique contribution (U), representing a pure two-body effect, synergistic (S) and redundant (R) contributions that describe cooperative effects on Y , due to X and \mathbf{Z} variables.

Conducting an exhaustive search for subsets \mathbf{z}_{\min} and \mathbf{z}_{\max} becomes unfeasible for large n . Here, we suggest employing a greedy strategy, whereby we perform a search over all the \mathbf{z} variables for the first variable to be tentatively used. Subsequently, variables are added one by one, to the previously selected ones, to construct the set of \mathbf{z} variables that either maximize or minimize the $L_{\mathbf{z}}$. The criterion for terminating the greedy search, minimizing (maximizing) the $L_{\mathbf{z}}$, is to stop when the corresponding decrease (increase) is compatible with a random effect. Therefore one can estimate the probability that the increase in $L_{\mathbf{z}}$ is lower (higher) than the one corresponding to the inclusion of a variable sharing the individual statistical properties of the selected one but being otherwise uncoupled from X and Y (surrogates of the selected z variable are obtained by permutation). If this probability is below a given threshold (corrected for multiple comparisons), the selected variable is thus added to the multiplet.

As a toy problem, to show how the proposed approach works, we firstly consider three zero mean unit variance Gaussian variables a_1 , a_2 and a_3 with correlations $\langle a_1 a_2 \rangle = 0.5$,

$\langle a_1 a_3 \rangle = 0.3$ and $\langle a_2 a_3 \rangle = -0.5$; here a_3 is a suppressor for a_2 [17] (and reciprocally a_2 is a suppressor for a_3), and this variables constitutes a synergistic triplet. Then, we consider b_1, b_2 and b_3 with correlations $\langle b_1 b_2 \rangle = 0.5$, $\langle b_1 b_3 \rangle = 0.3$ and $\langle b_2 b_3 \rangle = 0.5$: this a redundant triplet of variables as they are all positively correlated. Let c be an independent source, and $\{d_1, d_2\}$ two independent sources. The target variable y is defined as

$$Y = a_1 + b_1 + c + d_1 d_2 + \eta,$$

where η is a Gaussian noise term with standard deviation 0.05, and $\{d_1, d_2\}$ are synergistic for Y . The input variables will be denoted as: $X_1 = a_2, X_2 = a_3, X_3 = b_2, X_4 = b_3, X_5 = c, X_6 = d_1, X_7 = d_2$. Due to the construction of this example, as predictive model we use kernel regression with inhomogeneous polynomial kernel of degree 2, i.e. linear regression with augmented features consisting of all the monomials of the input variables with degree equal or less than two [18]. In Figure 1 we show the predictability decomposition for the




FIG. 1: Left: The predictability decomposition, for the toy problem, is depicted for the seven driving variables. Right: The LOCO and the pairwise index are depicted for the seven variables. For the driver X_1 we find $\mathbf{z}_{\max} = \{X_2\}$ and $\mathbf{z}_{\min} = \emptyset$; for the driver X_2 we find $\mathbf{z}_{\max} = \{X_1\}$ and $\mathbf{z}_{\min} = \emptyset$; for the driver X_3 we find $\mathbf{z}_{\min} = \{X_4\}$ and $\mathbf{z}_{\max} = \emptyset$; for the driver X_4 we find $\mathbf{z}_{\min} = \{X_3\}$ and $\mathbf{z}_{\max} = \emptyset$; for the driver X_5 we find $\mathbf{z}_{\max} = \mathbf{z}_{\min} = \emptyset$; for the driver X_6 we find $\mathbf{z}_{\max} = \{X_7\}$ and $\mathbf{z}_{\min} = \emptyset$; for the driver X_7 we find $\mathbf{z}_{\max} = \{X_6\}$ and $\mathbf{z}_{\min} = \emptyset$.

seven driving variables, as well as the LOCO and the pairwise predictive power for them. We observe that the proposed approach succeeds to highlight the importance and the nature of the contribution of drivers for predicting the target. Indeed X_1 and X_2 are recognized to be synergistic whilst X_3 and X_4 are recognized to be redundant (all these four features also provide unique contributions); X_5 only provides unique information about the target, while X_6 and X_7 are correctly identified as providing purely synergistic information. On the other hand, as it is clear from the right panel, LOCO underestimates the importance of the redundant variables X_3 and X_4 , whilst the pairwise index fails to evidence the synergistic contributions of X_1 , X_2 , X_6 and X_7 . It is worth stressing the difference between the two pairs of synergistic variables $\{X_1, X_2\}$ and $\{X_6, X_7\}$. The target Y is linearly dependent on X_1 and X_2 , hence these two variables are synergistic due their dependency (if X_1 and X_2 were independent, their synergy, for the proposed method, would be zero); on the other hand X_6 and X_7 are independent and synergistic due to the interaction (nonlinear) term $d_1 d_2$ which structurally contribute to Y .

Now we consider a dataset from a GEANT [19] based simulation of electron-proton inelastic scattering measured by a particle detector system, available in [20]. It consists of a very large number of samples of four different particles described by 6 detector signals. We consider only the samples of pion and proton ($n = 4752682$) particles to predict the two-valued target function defined by $y = 1$ for protons and $y = 0$ for pions; as in the previous example we use the hypothesis space induced by the inhomogeneous polynomial kernel of degree 2 (similar outputs are obtained using linear regression). The input features are the velocity β , the momentum p , the scattering angle θ , the number of emitted photoelectrons $nphe$, the response from an inner detector ein and the response from an outer detector $eout$. All variables are z-scored before processing.

In Figure 2 we depict the results from the proposed approach and both the LOCO and the pairwise index for the six variables. Concerning the pairwise index, the highest predictive power from individual features stems from, in order, β , p , and θ ; ein and $eout$ also show predictive power, whilst $nphe$ has negligible predictive power. LOCO, instead, is high just for β and p .

Using our approach, the most discriminating feature is the velocity β , which shows a large unique contribution as well as synergistic effects in cooperation with p and redundant effects with θ . The momentum p shows low importance alone (small U): it is relevant for




FIG. 2: Left: The predictability decomposition, for the particle discrimination problem, is depicted for the six driving variables. Right: The LOCO and the pairwise index are depicted for the six variables.

synergy in cooperation with β and redundantly with θ and ein . $eout$ is synergistic with β : this cooperative effect can be explained by the fact that protons release energy in the inner detectors, whilst pions are more likely to release energy in the outer detector. The redundancy of ein and $eout$ with p and β can be explained by the Bethe-Bloch formula for the energy-loss of charged particles in matter. We observe that θ is redundant with β and p , this means that given β and p the kinematics of the scattering does not provide further information about the particle. The feature $nphe$ is almost irrelevant (see Figure 3).

Compared with LOCO, our approach evidences the role of ein , $eout$ and θ in spite of their redundancy with β and p . Moreover it highlights the synergistic cooperation between β and p to improve the accuracy of particle discrimination: the knowledge of both β and p allows to infer the mass, hence we conclude that the synergistic information highlighted by our approach is related to the mass of particles.

Interestingly, another decomposition of LOCO has been recently proposed to disentangle interactions and dependencies in feature attribution (DIP) [21], where LOCO is expressed as a sum of each feature’s standalone contribution, the contribution due to interactions, and those due to main effect dependencies. In [21], the contributions from dependencies sums




FIG. 3: The redundant and the synergistic multiplets for each driving variable (each row), for the particle discrimination problem. The color value representing the decrement (increment) of LOCO due to the inclusion of that variable in the redundant (synergistic) multiplet. (see Figure 3)

up redundant and synergistic effects, whilst synergistic contributions due to interactions are singled out. Our decomposition, instead, is focused on disentangling redundancy and synergistic effects, and in our definition the synergy comprises both dependencies effects and interactions effects; hence the proposed approach and those described in [21] can be considered as complementary. Moreover, unlike the approach in [21], our approach allows to identify the other variables that build redundant and synergistic effects alongside the feature under consideration.

Summarizing, we have considered feature importance for regression, a fundamental tool for XAI, and introduced a novel definition of importance which takes into account the cooperation among features. The total importance is seen as the sum of a unique contribution, from the given feature, plus the redundant and synergistic contributions which measure the cooperation with other features. We believe that this framework will be useful also to get further insights in the cooperative behaviors of units in artificial neural networks [22].

Acknowledgments

We thank dr. Nicola Colonna (Istituto Nazionale Fisica Nucleare, Sezione di Bari, Italia) for useful discussions about GEANT.

LF, MOO and SS were supported by the project “HONEST - High-Order Dynamical Networks in Computational Neuroscience and Physiology: an Information-Theoretic Framework”, Italian Ministry of University and Research (funded by MUR, PRIN 2022, code 2022YMHNPY, CUP: B53D23003020006). SS was supported by the project “Higher-order complex systems modeling for personalized medicine”, Italian Ministry of University and Research (funded by MUR, PRIN 2022-PNRR, code P2022JAYMH, CUP: H53D23009130001).

-
- [1] S. Ali, T. Abuhmed, S. El-Sappagh, K. Muhammad, J.M. Alonso-Moral, R. Confalonieri, R. Guidotti, J. Del Ser, N. Díaz-Rodríguez, and F. Herrera, *Information Fusion* **99**, 1566 (2023).
 - [2] G. Casalicchio, C. Molnar, and B. Bischl, *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* **1105**, 655 (2019).
 - [3] J. Lei, M. G’sell, A. Rinaldo, R.J. Tibshirani, and L. Wasserman, *J. Am. Stat. Ass.* **113**, 1094 (2018).
 - [4] F. Rosas, P. Mediano, A. Luppi, T. Varley, J. Lizier, S. Stramaglia, H. Jensen, and D. Marinazzo, *Nat. Phys.* **18**, 476 (2022).
 - [5] F. Battiston, E. Amico, A. Barrat, G. Bianconi, G. Ferraz, Arruda, B. Franceschiello, I. Iacopini, S. Kéfi, V. Latora, Y. Moreno, M. Murray, T. Peixoto, F. Vaccarino, and G. Petri, *Nat. Phys.* **17**, 1093 (2021).
 - [6] P. L. Williams and R. D. Beer, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1004.2515* (2010).
 - [7] J. T. Lizier, N. Bertschinger, J. Jost, and M. Wibral, *Entropy* **20**, 307 (2018).
 - [8] L. Angelini, M. de Tommaso, D. Marinazzo, L. Nitti, M. Pellicoro, and S. Stramaglia, *Phys. Rev. E* **81**, 037201 (2010).
 - [9] L. Faes, D. Marinazzo, S. Stramaglia, F. Jurysta, A. Porta, Nollo G., *Philos Trans A Math Phys Eng Sci.* **374**, 2067 (2016).
 - [10] S. Stramaglia, L. Angelini, G. Wu, J.M. Cortes, L. Faes, D. Marinazzo, *IEEE Trans. Biomed. Eng.* **63**, 2518 (2016).

- [11] A.B. Barrett, *Phys. Rev. E* **91**, 052802, (2014).
- [12] T. Schreiber, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 461 (2000).
- [13] S. Stramaglia, L. Faes, J.M. Cortes, and D. Marinazzo, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **6**, L032007 (2024).
- [14] In general it is preferable to estimate the mean squared error by cross validation, however when the number of samples is sufficiently high, like in the examples reported in this paper, evaluation on the training data may be used as well.
- [15] In particular, for all learning methods for regression whose risk minimizer remains unchanged when new variables, statistically independent of input and target variables, are added to the set of input variables; this property holds for linear models and for hypothesis spaces induced by inhomogeneous polynomial and Gaussian kernel functions, see N. Ancona and S. Stramaglia, *Neural Computation* **18** , 749 (2006).
- [16] A.J. Conger, *Educational and Psychological Measurement* **34**, 35 (1974).
- [17] G.H. Maasen and A.B. Bakker, *Sociological Methods & Research* **30**, 241 (2001).
- [18] J. Shawe-Taylor and N. Cristianini, *Kernel Methods For Pattern Analysis*. Cambridge University Press (2004).
- [19] <https://geant4.web.cern.ch>
- [20] <https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/naharrison/particle-identification-from-detector-responses>.
- [21] G. König, E. Günther and U. von Luxburg, Disentangling Interactions and Dependencies in Feature Attribution, *preprint arXiv:2410.23772* (2024).
- [22] K. Clauw, S. Stramaglia and D. Marinazzo, Higher-order mutual information reveals synergistic sub-networks for multi-neuron importance, *preprint arXiv:2211.00416* (2022).