

SHAP scores fail pervasively even when Lipschitz succeeds

Olivier Létoffé¹, Xuanxiang Huang², Joao Marques-Silva³

¹Univ. Toulouse, France

²CNRS@CREATE, Singapore

³ICREA, Univ. Lleida, Spain

olivier.letoffe@orange.fr, xuanxiang.huang.cs@gmail.com, jpms@icrea.cat

Abstract

The ubiquitous use of Shapley values in eXplainable AI (XAI) has been triggered by the tool SHAP, and as a result are commonly referred to as SHAP scores. Recent work devised examples of machine learning (ML) classifiers for which the computed SHAP scores are thoroughly unsatisfactory, by allowing human decision-makers to be misled. Nevertheless, such examples could be perceived as somewhat artificial, since the selected classes must be interpreted as numeric. Furthermore, it was unclear how general were the issues identified with SHAP scores. This paper answers these criticisms. First, the paper shows that for Boolean classifiers there are arbitrarily many examples for which the SHAP scores must be deemed unsatisfactory. Second, the paper shows that the issues with SHAP scores are also observed in the case of regression models. In addition, the paper studies the class of regression models that respect Lipschitz continuity, a measure of a function's rate of change that finds important recent uses in ML, including model robustness. Concretely, the paper shows that the issues with SHAP scores occur even for regression models that respect Lipschitz continuity. Finally, the paper shows that the same issues are guaranteed to exist for arbitrarily differentiable regression models.

Introduction

SHAP scores (Lundberg and Lee 2017) denote the use of Shapley values in eXplainable AI (XAI).¹ Popularized by the tool SHAP (Lundberg and Lee 2017), SHAP scores find an ever-increasing range of practical uses, that have continued to expand at a fast pace in recent years (Molnar 2023; Mishra 2023). Many proposed applications of SHAP scores impact human beings, in different ways, and so are categorized as being high-risk (European Union 2024). Given the advances in machine learning, and the proposals for regulating its use (High-Level Expert Group on AI 2019; US Government 2023; European Union 2024), one should expect the uses of SHAP scores to continue to increase.

Despite their immense success, SHAP scores face a number of well-known limitations. First, there are practical limitations, as exemplified by a number of recent works (Janzing, Minorics, and Blöbaum 2020; Kumar et al. 2020; Sundararajan and Najmi 2020; Kumar et al. 2021). Second, as reported

in recent work (Huang and Marques-Silva 2023), there are theoretical limitations. Concretely, there exist machine learning (ML) classifiers for which the computed SHAP scores are thoroughly unsatisfactory given self-evident properties of those classifiers. The theoretical limitations of SHAP scores should be perceived as rather problematic, since they challenge the foundations of SHAP scores, and so also serve to question the experimental results obtained in massive numbers of practical uses of SHAP scores.

Nevertheless, the example classifiers studied in earlier work (Huang and Marques-Silva 2023) can be criticized in different ways. First, it is unclear whether those classifiers are easy to devise, i.e. it might be the case that the identified examples were selected from among a small number of possible cases. Second, the theoretical limitations of SHAP scores were proved for the concrete case of ML classifiers, where classes are viewed as numeric values (Huang and Marques-Silva 2023). Still in many important uses of ML, the computed output is most often a real value (e.g. some probability). As a result, one might hope that the theoretical limitations of SHAP scores would not apply in those settings.

This paper proves that such hypothetical criticisms are without merit. First, the paper proves that there are arbitrarily many boolean classifiers which will exhibit one or more of the issues identified with SHAP scores. Second, the paper demonstrates the existence of regression models for which the computed SHAP scores are also entirely unsatisfactory. Second, and given the importance of Lipschitz continuity in adversarial robustness (Cranko et al. 2021; Pauli et al. 2022), the paper also shows the existence of Lipschitz-continuous regression models for which the computed SHAP scores are guaranteed to (again) be unsatisfactory. Furthermore, some of the proposed regression models are parameterized, meaning that the number of examples of regression models with unsatisfactory SHAP scores is unbounded, and the degree of dissatisfaction can be made arbitrarily large. Third, and finally, the paper shows that additional regression models are guaranteed to exist for arbitrarily differentiable regression functions. To prove the above results, the paper exploits a generalization of the standard definitions in formal explainability (Wäldchen et al. 2021; Marques-Silva and Ignatiev 2022; Darwiche 2023), to account for regression models, especially when those regression models are defined on real-

¹Proposed in the 1950s (Shapley 1953), Shapley values find important uses in different domains, that include game theory among others (Roth 1988).

value features.

Preliminaries

Classification & regression problems. Let $\mathcal{F} = \{1, \dots, m\}$ denote a set of features. Each feature $i \in \mathcal{F}$ takes values from a domain \mathbb{D}_i . Domains can be categorical or ordinal. If ordinal, domains can be discrete or real-valued. Feature space is defined by $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{D}_1 \times \mathbb{D}_2 \times \dots \times \mathbb{D}_m$. The notation $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_m)$ denotes an arbitrary point in feature space, where each x_i is a variable taking values from \mathbb{D}_i . Moreover, the notation $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_m)$ represents a specific point in feature space, where each v_i is a constant representing one concrete value from \mathbb{D}_i . A classifier maps each point in feature space to a class taken from $\mathcal{K} = \{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_K\}$. Classes can also be categorical or ordinal. A boolean classifier denotes the situation where $\mathbb{D}_i = \mathbb{B} = \{0, 1\}$. In the case of regression, each point in feature space is mapped to an ordinal value taken from a set \mathbb{K} , e.g. \mathbb{K} could denote \mathbb{Z} or \mathbb{R} . Therefore, a classifier \mathcal{M}_C is characterized by a non-constant *classification function* κ that maps feature space \mathbb{F} into the set of classes \mathcal{K} , i.e. $\kappa : \mathbb{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$. A regression model \mathcal{M}_R is characterized by a non-constant *regression function* ρ that maps feature space \mathbb{F} into the set elements from \mathbb{K} , i.e. $\rho : \mathbb{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$. A classifier model \mathcal{M}_C is represented by a tuple $(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathcal{K}, \kappa)$, whereas a regression model \mathcal{M}_R is represented by a tuple $(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{K}, \rho)$. When viable, we will represent an ML model \mathcal{M} by a tuple $(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{T}, \tau)$, with $\tau : \mathbb{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}$, without specifying whether \mathcal{M} denotes a classification or a regression model. A *sample* (or instance) denotes a pair (\mathbf{v}, q) , where $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{F}$ and either $q \in \mathcal{K}$, with $q = \kappa(\mathbf{v})$, or $q \in \mathbb{K}$, with $q = \rho(\mathbf{v})$.

Running example(s). Figure 1 shows a function in tabular representation (TR) that will be used as one of the running examples, we denote this model as \mathcal{M}_1 . Clearly, $\mathcal{F} = \{1, 2\}$, $\mathbb{D}_1 = \mathbb{D}_2 = \{0, 1\}$, $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{D}_1 \times \mathbb{D}_2$. Depending on the value of $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, the model \mathcal{M}_1 will be viewed as a classification or as a regression model (James et al. 2017). As a result, we will refer to the function computed by \mathcal{M}_1 as $\tau_1 : \mathbb{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}$. If the values in the last column $\tau_1(\mathbf{x})$ are integers, then we say that we have a classification model, with the set of classes \mathcal{K} given by the values in the last column, and so τ_1 corresponds to a classification function $\kappa_1 : \mathbb{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$, with $\mathcal{K} = \{1 - 6\alpha, 1, 1 + 2\alpha\}$. Otherwise, if some values in the last column $\tau_1(\mathbf{x})$ are real numbers, then we say that we have a regression model, with the (finite) set of values in the codomain given by the values in the last column, and so τ_1 corresponds to a regression function $\rho_1 : \mathbb{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$, with $\mathbb{K} = \{1 - 6\alpha, 1, 1 + 2\alpha\}$. Besides the function shown in Figure 1, additional running examples will be introduced later in the paper.

Lipschitz continuity. Let $(\mathbb{F}, \mathfrak{d}_F)$ and $(\mathbb{R}, \mathfrak{d}_R)$ denote metric spaces.² A regression function $\rho : \mathbb{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is Lipschitz-continuous (O’Searcoid 2006) if there exists a constant $C \geq$

² $\mathfrak{d}_F : \mathbb{F} \times \mathbb{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathfrak{d}_R : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ denote distance functions between two points, which we refer to as \mathfrak{d} . A distance function \mathfrak{d} respects the well-known axioms: (i) $\mathfrak{d}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) = 0$; (ii) if $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{y}$, then $\mathfrak{d}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) > 0$; (iii) $\mathfrak{d}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \mathfrak{d}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x})$; and (iv) $\mathfrak{d}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) \leq \mathfrak{d}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) + \mathfrak{d}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})$. Examples of distance functions in-

row	x_1	x_2	$\tau_1(\mathbf{x})$
1	0	0	$1 - 6\alpha$
2	0	1	$1 + 2\alpha$
3	1	0	1
4	1	1	1

Figure 1: Tabular representation (TR) of a simple function. The target sample is $((1, 1), 1)$.

0 such that,

$$\forall(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \in \mathbb{F}). \mathfrak{d}_R(\rho(\mathbf{x}_1), \rho(\mathbf{x}_2)) \leq C \mathfrak{d}_F(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2), \quad (1)$$

where C is referred to as the Lipschitz constant. It is well-known that any Lipschitz-continuous function is also continuous.

The relationship between Lipschitz continuity and adversarial robustness has been acknowledged for more than a decade (Szegedy et al. 2014), i.e. since the brittleness of ML models was recognized as a significant limitation of neural networks (NNs). In recent years, Lipschitz bounds has been used for training ML models towards achieving some degree of robustness (Hein and Andriushchenko 2017; Weng et al. 2018; Virmaux and Scaman 2018; Fazlyab et al. 2019; Jordan and Dimakis 2020; Cranko et al. 2021; Huang et al. 2021; Pauli et al. 2022; Zhang et al. 2022; Hanspal and Lomuscio 2023; Havens et al. 2023).

Additional notation. An explanation problem is a tuple $\mathcal{E} = (\mathcal{M}, (\mathbf{v}, q))$, where \mathcal{M} can either be a classification or a regression model, and (\mathbf{v}, q) is a target sample, with $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{F}$. For example, for the running example in Figure 1, given the target sample $(\mathbf{v}_1, q_1) = ((1, 1), 1)$, we can define an explanation problem $\mathcal{E}_1 = (\mathcal{M}_1, (\mathbf{v}_1, q_1))$.

Given $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{F}$, and $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$, the predicate $\mathbf{x}_\mathcal{S} = \mathbf{v}_\mathcal{S}$ is defined as follows:

$$\mathbf{x}_\mathcal{S} = \mathbf{v}_\mathcal{S} := \left(\bigwedge_{i \in \mathcal{S}} x_i = v_i \right).$$

The set of points for which $\mathbf{x}_\mathcal{S} = \mathbf{v}_\mathcal{S}$ is defined by $\Upsilon(\mathcal{S}; \mathbf{v}) = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F} \mid \mathbf{x}_\mathcal{S} = \mathbf{v}_\mathcal{S}\}$.

Distributions, expected value. Throughout the paper, it is assumed a *uniform probability distribution* on features \mathcal{F} , and such that all features are independent. The *expected value* of an ML model $\tau : \mathbb{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}$ is denoted by $\mathbf{E}[\tau]$. Furthermore, let $\mathbf{E}[\tau(\mathbf{x}) \mid \mathbf{x}_\mathcal{S} = \mathbf{v}_\mathcal{S}]$ represent the expected of τ over points in feature space consistent with the coordinates of \mathbf{v} dictated by \mathcal{S} . For discrete-valued features, $\mathbf{E}[\tau(\mathbf{x}) \mid \mathbf{x}_\mathcal{S} = \mathbf{v}_\mathcal{S}]$ is as follows:

$$\mathbf{E}[\tau(\mathbf{x}) \mid \mathbf{x}_\mathcal{S} = \mathbf{v}_\mathcal{S}] := 1/|\Upsilon(\mathcal{S}; \mathbf{v})| \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \Upsilon(\mathcal{S}; \mathbf{v})} \tau(\mathbf{x}). \quad (2)$$

For real-valued features, $\mathbf{E}[\tau(\mathbf{x}) \mid \mathbf{x}_\mathcal{S} = \mathbf{v}_\mathcal{S}]$ is as follows:

$$\mathbf{E}[\tau(\mathbf{x}) \mid \mathbf{x}_\mathcal{S} = \mathbf{v}_\mathcal{S}] := 1/|\Upsilon(\mathcal{S}; \mathbf{v})| \int_{\Upsilon(\mathcal{S}; \mathbf{v})} \tau(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}. \quad (3)$$

Shapley values & SHAP scores. Shapley values were proposed in the context of game theory in the early 1950s by

clude Hamming, Manhattan, Euclidean and other distance defined by norm l_p , $p \geq 1$, where $\|\mathbf{x}\|_p := (\sum_{i=1}^m |x_i|^p)^{1/p}$.

\mathcal{S}	$\text{rows}(\mathcal{S})$	$v_e(\mathcal{S})$
\emptyset	1, 2, 3, 4	$1 - \alpha$
$\{1\}$	3, 4	1
$\{2\}$	2, 4	$1 + \alpha$
$\{1, 2\}$	4	1

Table 1: Expected values of τ_1 for all possible sets \mathcal{S} of fixed features, given the target sample $((1, 1), 1)$.

L. S. Shapley (Shapley 1953). Shapley values were defined given some set \mathcal{S} , and a *characteristic function*, i.e. a real-valued function defined on the subsets of \mathcal{S} , $v : 2^{\mathcal{S}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.³ It is well-known that Shapley values represent the *unique* function that, given \mathcal{S} and v , respects a number of important axioms. More detail about Shapley values is available in standard references (Shapley 1953; Dubey 1975; Young 1985; Roth 1988).

In the context of explainability, Shapley values are most often referred to as SHAP scores (Strumbelj and Kononenko 2010, 2014; Lundberg and Lee 2017; Arenas et al. 2021, 2023), and consider a specific characteristic function $v_e : 2^{\mathcal{F}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, which is defined by,

$$v_e(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{E}) := \mathbf{E}[\tau(\mathbf{x}) \mid \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}}]. \quad (4)$$

Thus, given a set \mathcal{S} of features, $v_e(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{E})$ represents the expected value of the classifier over the points of feature space represented by $\Upsilon(\mathcal{S}; \mathbf{v})$.

Example 1. (Expected values for τ_1 .) For the explanation problem \mathcal{E}_1 , the expected values of τ_1 for all possible sets \mathcal{S} of fixed features are shown in Table 1.

The formulation presented in earlier work (Arenas et al. 2021, 2023) allows for different input distributions when computing the expected values. For the purposes of this paper, it suffices to consider solely a uniform input distribution, and so the dependency on the input distribution is not accounted for. Independently of the distribution considered, it should be clear that in most cases $v_e(\emptyset) \neq 0$; this is the case for example with boolean classifiers (Arenas et al. 2021, 2023).

To simplify the notation, the following definitions are used,

$$\Delta_i(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{E}, v) := (v(\mathcal{S} \cup \{i\}) - v(\mathcal{S})), \quad (5)$$

$$\zeta(\mathcal{S}) := \frac{|\mathcal{S}|!(|\mathcal{F}| - |\mathcal{S}| - 1)!}{|\mathcal{F}|!}, \quad (6)$$

(Observe that Δ_i is parameterized on \mathcal{E} and v .)

Finally, let $\text{Sc}_E : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, i.e. the SHAP score for feature i , be defined by,⁴

$$\text{Sc}_E(i; \mathcal{E}, v_e) := \sum_{\mathcal{S} \subseteq (\mathcal{F} \setminus \{i\})} \zeta(\mathcal{S}) \times \Delta_i(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{E}, v_e). \quad (7)$$

Given a sample (\mathbf{v}, q) , the SHAP score assigned to each feature measures the *contribution* of that feature with respect to the prediction. From earlier work, it is understood that a pos-

³The original formulation also required super-additivity of the characteristic function, but that condition has been relaxed in more recent works (Dubey 1975; Young 1985).

⁴Throughout the paper, the definitions of Δ_i and Sc are explicitly associated with the characteristic function used in their definition.

itive/negative value indicates that the feature can contribute to changing the prediction, whereas a value of 0 indicates no contribution (Strumbelj and Kononenko 2010).

Related work. SHAP scores, i.e. the use of Shapley values in XAI, are being used ubiquitously in a wide range of practical domains, especially through the use of the tool SHAP (Lundberg and Lee 2017). The practical limitations of SHAP scores, e.g. the results obtained with the tool SHAP, have been documented in the literature (Janzing, Minorics, and Blöbaum 2020; Sundararajan and Najmi 2020; Kumar et al. 2020, 2021). The theoretical limitations of SHAP scores, i.e. issues resulting from existing definitions of SHAP scores and obtained independently of the tool SHAP, were reported in recent work (Huang and Marques-Silva 2023), but targeting only classification models. More recent work proposed solutions for addressing the theoretical limitations of SHAP scores (Yu, Ignatiev, and Stuckey 2023; Biradar et al. 2023; Yu et al. 2023; Biradar et al. 2024). However, the proposed solutions do not represent SHAP scores.

To the best of our knowledge, the identification of theoretical limitations of SHAP scores in the case of regression models, including regression models that respect Lipschitz continuity has not been investigated.

Formal Explainability & Adversarial Examples

We will opt to define a *similarity* predicate, which will enable us to abstract away the details of whether the ML model relates with classification or regression.

Similarity predicate. Given an ML model and some input \mathbf{x} , the output of the ML model is *distinguishable* with respect to the sample (\mathbf{v}, q) if the observed change in the model’s output is deemed sufficient; otherwise it is *similar* (or indistinguishable). This is represented by a *similarity* predicate (which can be viewed as a boolean function) $\sigma : \mathbb{F} \rightarrow \{\perp, \top\}$ (where \perp signifies *false*, and \top signifies *true*).⁵ Concretely, given $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$, $\sigma(\mathbf{x}; \mathcal{E})$ holds true iff the change in the ML model output is deemed *insufficient* and so no observable difference exists between the ML model’s output for \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{v} by a factor of δ .⁶

For regression problems, given a change in the input from \mathbf{v} to \mathbf{x} , a change in the output is indistinguishable (i.e. the outputs are similar) if,

$$\sigma(\mathbf{x}; \mathcal{E}) := [|\rho(\mathbf{x}) - \rho(\mathbf{v})| \leq \delta],$$

otherwise, it is distinguishable.⁷

⁵For simplicity, and with a minor abuse of notation, when σ is used in a scalar context, it is interpreted as a boolean function, i.e. $\sigma : \mathbb{F} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, with 0 replacing \perp and 1 replacing \top .

⁶Throughout the paper, parameterizations are shown after the separator ‘;’, and will be elided when clear from the context.

⁷Exploiting a threshold to decide whether there exists an observable change has been used in the context of adversarial robustness (Wu, Wu, and Barrett 2023). Furthermore, the relationship between adversarial examples and explanations is well-known (Ignatiev, Narodytska, and Marques-Silva 2019; Wu, Wu, and Barrett 2023).

For classification problems, similarity is defined to equate with not changing the predicted class, in which case the parameter δ is always 0. Given a change in the input from \mathbf{v} to \mathbf{x} , a change in the output is indistinguishable (i.e. the outputs are similar) if,

$$\sigma(\mathbf{x}; \mathcal{E}) := [\kappa(\mathbf{x}) - \kappa(\mathbf{v}) \leq 0],$$

otherwise, it is distinguishable. Alternatively, it can be represented as

$$\sigma(\mathbf{x}; \mathcal{E}) := [\kappa(\mathbf{x}) = \kappa(\mathbf{v})].$$

(As shown in the remainder of this paper, σ allows abstracting away whether the underlying model implements classification or regression.)

In the remainder of the paper, we will be computing the expected value of the similarity predicate σ . In those situations, the similarity predicate will be interpreted as a boolean function, where \perp corresponds to 0, and \top corresponds to 1. (Clearly, we could use additional notation to avoid this minor abuse of notation, but opt instead to keep the notation as simple as possible.) When σ is interpreted as a boolean function it can be viewed as a regression model that predicts one of two possible values, i.e. 0 and 1; hence, we can compute the expected value of σ using either (2) or (3).

Adversarial examples. Adversarial examples serve to reveal the brittleness of ML models (Szegedy et al. 2014; Goodfellow, Shlens, and Szegedy 2015). Adversarial robustness indicates the absence of adversarial examples. The importance of deciding adversarial robustness is illustrated by a wealth of competing alternatives (Brix et al. 2023).

Given a sample (\mathbf{v}, q) , and a norm l_p , a point $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}$ is an *adversarial example* (AEx) if the prediction for \mathbf{x} is distinguishable from that for \mathbf{v} . Formally, we write,

$$\text{AEx}(\mathbf{x}; \mathcal{E}) := (\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{v}\|_{l_p} \leq \epsilon) \wedge \neg\sigma(\mathbf{x}; \mathcal{E})$$

where the l_p distance between the given point \mathbf{v} and other points of interest is restricted to $\epsilon > 0$. Moreover, we define a *constrained adversarial example*, such that the allowed set of points is given by the predicate $\mathbf{x}_S = \mathbf{v}_S$. Thus,

$$\text{AEx}(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{S}; \mathcal{E}) := (\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{v}\|_{l_p} \leq \epsilon) \wedge (\mathbf{x}_S = \mathbf{v}_S) \wedge \neg\sigma(\mathbf{x}; \mathcal{E})$$

Additionally, we use l_p -minimal AExs to refer to AExs having the minimal distance measured by the norm l_p around the given point \mathbf{v} .

Example 2. (AExs for \mathcal{E}_1 .) We consider the norm l_0 , i.e. the Hamming distance. For the explanation problem \mathcal{E}_1 , there is a distance 1 AEx, i.e. by changing feature 1 to a value other than 1, the prediction changes to $1 + 2\alpha$, this assuming the value of feature 2 is also 1. Moreover, if feature 1 is fixed, i.e. $1 \in \mathcal{S}$, then model does not have *any* AEx. It is also plain that feature 2 does not occur is any l_0 -minimal AEx for \mathcal{E}_1 .

Abductive and contrastive explanations. Abductive and contrastive explanations (AXps/CXps) represent the two examples of formal explanations for classification problems (Waldchen et al. 2021; Marques-Silva and Ignatiev 2022; Darwiche 2023). This paper studies a generalized formulation that also encompasses regression problems.

A weak abductive explanation (WAXp) denotes a set of features $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$, such that for every point in feature space the ML model output is *similar* to the given sample: (\mathbf{v}, q) . The

\mathcal{S}	$\mathcal{F} \setminus \mathcal{S}$	rows(\mathcal{S})	WAXp(\mathcal{S})?	WCXp($\mathcal{F} \setminus \mathcal{S}$)?
\emptyset	$\{1, 2\}$	1, 2, 3, 4	No	Yes
$\{1\}$	$\{2\}$	3, 4	Yes	No
$\{2\}$	$\{1\}$	2, 4	No	Yes
$\{1, 2\}$	\emptyset	4	Yes	No

Table 2: WAXps/WCXps of \mathcal{E}_1 for all possible sets \mathcal{S} of fixed features.

condition for a set of features to represent a WAXp (which also defines a corresponding predicate WAXp) is as follows:

$$\text{WAXp}(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{E}) := \mathbf{E}[\sigma(\mathbf{x}; \mathcal{E}) \mid \mathbf{x}_S = \mathbf{v}_S] = 1. \quad (8)$$

Moreover, an AXp is a subset-minimal WAXp, that is,

$$\text{AXp}(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{E}) := \text{WAXp}(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{E}) \wedge \forall (t \in \mathcal{S}). \neg \text{WAXp}(\mathcal{S} \setminus \{t\}; \mathcal{E}). \quad (9)$$

A weak contrastive explanation (WCXp) denotes a set of features $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$, such that there exists some point in feature space, where only the features in \mathcal{S} are allowed to change, that makes the ML model output distinguishable from the given sample (\mathbf{v}, q) . The condition for a set of features to represent a WCXp (which also defines a corresponding predicate WCXp) is as follows:

$$\text{WCXp}(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{E}) := \mathbf{E}[\sigma(\mathbf{x}; \mathcal{E}) \mid \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{F} \setminus \mathcal{S}} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{F} \setminus \mathcal{S}}] < 1. \quad (10)$$

Moreover, a CXp is a subset-minimal WCXp, that is,

$$\text{CXp}(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{E}) := \text{WCXp}(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{E}) \wedge \forall (t \in \mathcal{S}). \neg \text{WCXp}(\mathcal{S} \setminus \{t\}; \mathcal{E}). \quad (11)$$

Example 3. (AXps/CXps for \mathcal{E}_1 .) For the explanation problem \mathcal{E}_1 , let us first consider a classification model, i.e. all $\tau_1(\mathbf{x})$ are integer values, each denoting a class.

If feature 1 is fixed to value 1, then the prediction is 1, and so the expected value of the similarity predicate is also 1. Otherwise, if the value of feature 1 changes to a value other than 1, then the prediction is some value other than 1. Thus, the similarity predicate is not 1 on all points of feature space, and so its expected value is less than 1. As result, it is immediate that $\{1\}$ is one (and the only) AXp, whereas $\{1\}$ is the one (and also the only) CXp.

Now let us consider that \mathcal{M}_1 implements a regression function, e.g. some $\tau_1(\mathbf{x})$ are real value. In this case, we need to specify a value of δ for the similarity predicate. Clearly, the value of δ cannot be arbitrarily large; otherwise we would be unable to distinguish 1 from the other values. For example, for $\alpha > 0$, we can pick a value of δ no larger than α .

In this case, the sets of AXps and CXps remains unchanged. The computation of AXps/CXps for the explanation problem \mathcal{E}_1 are summarized in Table 2.

One can prove that a set of features is an AXp iff it is a minimal hitting set of the set of CXps, and vice-versa (Marques-Silva and Ignatiev 2022). (Although this result has been proved for classification problems, the use of the similarity predicate generalizes the result also to regression problems.)

By examining the definitions of AEx and WCXp, it is straightforward to prove that there exists a constrained AEx with the features $\mathcal{F} \setminus \mathcal{S}$ iff the set \mathcal{S} is a weak CXp.

$i = 1$					
\mathcal{S}	$v_e(\mathcal{S})$	$v_e(\mathcal{S} \cup \{1\})$	$\Delta_1(\mathcal{S})$	$\varsigma(\mathcal{S})$	$\varsigma(\mathcal{S}) \times \Delta_1(\mathcal{S})$
\emptyset	$1 - \alpha$	1	α	$1/2$	$\alpha/2$
$\{2\}$	$1 + \alpha$	1	$-\alpha$	$1/2$	$-\alpha/2$
$\text{Sc}_E(1) =$					0
$i = 2$					
\mathcal{S}	$v_e(\mathcal{S})$	$v_e(\mathcal{S} \cup \{2\})$	$\Delta_2(\mathcal{S})$	$\varsigma(\mathcal{S})$	$\varsigma(\mathcal{S}) \times \Delta_2(\mathcal{S})$
\emptyset	$1 - \alpha$	$1 + \alpha$	2α	$1/2$	α
$\{1\}$	1	1	0	$1/2$	0
$\text{Sc}_E(2) =$					α

Table 3: Computation of SHAP scores for \mathcal{E}_1 .

Feature (ir)relevancy. The set of features that are included in at least one (abductive) explanation are defined as follows:

$$\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{E}) := \{i \in \mathcal{X} \mid \mathcal{X} \in 2^{\mathcal{F}} \wedge \text{AXp}(\mathcal{X})\}, \quad (12)$$

where predicate $\text{AXp}(\mathcal{X})$ holds true iff \mathcal{X} is an AXp. (A well-known result is that $\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{E})$ remains unchanged if CXps are used instead of AXps (Marques-Silva and Ignatiev 2022).) Finally, a feature $i \in \mathcal{F}$ is *irrelevant*, i.e. predicate $\text{Irrelevant}(i)$ holds true, if $i \notin \mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{E})$; otherwise feature i is *relevant*, and predicate $\text{Relevant}(i)$ holds true. Clearly, given some explanation problem \mathcal{E} , $\forall(i \in \mathcal{F}). \text{Irrelevant}(i) \leftrightarrow \neg \text{Relevant}(i)$.

Example 4. ((Ir)relevant features for \mathcal{E}_1 .) Given that $\{\{1\}\}$ denotes the set of AXps (and of CXps), it is immediate that feature 1 is relevant, and feature 2 is irrelevant.

New Limitations of SHAP Scores

The recent proposal of polynomial-time algorithms for the exact computation of SHAP scores (Arenas et al. 2021; Van den Broeck et al. 2021, 2022; Arenas et al. 2023) has facilitated their more rigorous assessment. Building on those efficient algorithms for computing SHAP scores, recent work uncovered examples of classifiers for which the computed (exact) scores are thoroughly unsatisfactory (Huang and Marques-Silva 2023).

Classification – Boolean Domains

This section proves that for arbitrary large numbers of variables, there exist boolean functions and samples for which the SHAP scores exhibit the issues reported in recent work (Huang and Marques-Silva 2023). The detailed proofs are included in the supplemental materials. Given a classifier \mathcal{M} , with sample (\mathbf{v}, c) , and with $i, i_1, i_2 \in \mathcal{F}$, the issues are shown in Table 4.

Throughout this section, let m be the number of variables of the functions we start from, and let n denote the number of variables of the functions we will be constructing. In this case, we set $\mathcal{F} = \{1, \dots, n\}$. Furthermore, for the sake of simplicity, we opt to introduce the new features as the last features (e.g., feature n). Besides, we opt to set the values of these additional features to 1 in the sample (\mathbf{v}, c) that we

intend to explain, that is, $v_n = 1$. When considering two additional features, feature n and feature $n-1$, we will assume that feature n is irrelevant while feature $n-1$ is relevant. This choice does not affect the proof’s argument in any way.

For a boolean function κ , we use κ_0 to denote the conditioning of the function κ on $x_n = 0$ (i.e. $\kappa|_{x_n=0}$), and κ_1 to denote the conditioning of the function κ on $x_n = 1$. Besides, we use κ_{00} to denote the conditioning of the function κ on $x_n = 0$ and $x_{n-1} = 0$ (i.e. $\kappa|_{x_n=0, x_{n-1}=0}$), κ_{01} for the conditioning on $x_n = 0$ and $x_{n-1} = 1$, κ_{10} for the conditioning on $x_n = 1$ and $x_{n-1} = 0$, and κ_{11} for the conditioning on $x_n = 1$ and $x_{n-1} = 1$. Moreover, under a uniform input distribution, the following equations hold in general.

$$\mathbf{E}[\kappa] = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \mathbf{E}[\kappa_0] + \frac{1}{2} \cdot \mathbf{E}[\kappa_1], \quad (13)$$

$$\Delta_n(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{E}, v_e) = \frac{1}{2} \cdot (\mathbf{E}[\kappa_1 | \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}}] - \mathbf{E}[\kappa_0 | \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}}]). \quad (14)$$

By choosing different functions for κ_{00} , κ_{01} , κ_{10} and κ_{11} , we are able to construct functions κ exhibiting the issues reported in Table 4.

Proposition 1. For any $n \geq 3$, there exist boolean functions defined on n variables, and at least one sample, which exhibit an issue I1, i.e. there exists an irrelevant feature $i \in \mathcal{F}$, such that $\text{Sc}_E(i) \neq 0$.

Proposition 2. For any odd $n \geq 3$, there exist boolean functions defined on n variables, and at least one sample, which exhibits an issue I3, i.e. there exists a relevant feature $i \in \mathcal{F}$, such that $\text{Sc}_E(i) = 0$.

Proposition 3. For any even $n \geq 4$, there exist boolean functions defined on n variables, and at least one sample, which exhibits an issue I4, i.e. there exists an irrelevant feature $i_1 \in \mathcal{F}$, such that $\text{Sc}_E(i_1) \neq 0$, and a relevant feature $i_2 \in \mathcal{F} \setminus \{i_1\}$, such that $\text{Sc}_E(i_2) = 0$.

Proposition 4. For any $n \geq 4$, there exists boolean functions defined on n variables, and at least one sample, which exhibits an issue I5, i.e. there exists an irrelevant feature $i \in \mathcal{F}$, such that $|\text{Sc}_E(i)| = \max\{|\text{Sc}_E(j)| \mid j \in \mathcal{F}\}$.

Proposition 5. For any $n \geq 4$, there exist functions defined on n variables, and at least one sample, which exhibits an issue I6, i.e. there exists an irrelevant feature $i_1 \in \mathcal{F}$, and a relevant feature $i_2 \in \mathcal{F} \setminus \{i_1\}$, such that $\text{Sc}_E(i_1) \times \text{Sc}_E(i_2) > 0$.

Proposition 6. For boolean classifiers, if $\mathcal{E} = (\mathcal{M}, (\mathbf{v}, c))$ exhibits an identified issue (I1 to I6), so does $\mathcal{E}' = (\mathcal{M}', (\mathbf{v}, -c))$, where \mathcal{M}' is the negated classifier of \mathcal{M} .

The implication of Proposition 6 is that all the identified issues distributed evenly for samples where the prediction takes value 1 and samples where the prediction takes value 0.

Classification – Real-valued Domains

Evidently, equations (13) and (14) can be extended to discrete domains and real-valued domains. The difference lies

Issue	Condition
I1	$\text{Irrelevant}(i) \wedge (\text{Sc}_E(i) \neq 0)$
I2	$\text{Irrelevant}(i_1) \wedge \text{Relevant}(i_2) \wedge (\text{Sc}_E(i_1) > \text{Sc}_E(i_2))$
I3	$\text{Relevant}(i) \wedge (\text{Sc}_E(i) = 0)$
I4	$[\text{Irrelevant}(i_1) \wedge (\text{Sc}_E(i_1) \neq 0)] \wedge [\text{Relevant}(i_2) \wedge (\text{Sc}_E(i_2) = 0)]$
I5	$[\text{Irrelevant}(i) \wedge \forall_{1 \leq j \leq m, j \neq i} (\text{Sc}_E(j) < \text{Sc}_E(i))]$
I6	$[\text{Irrelevant}(i_1) \wedge \text{Relevant}(i_2) \wedge (\text{Sc}_E(i_1) \times \text{Sc}_E(i_2) > 0)]$

Table 4: Issues with SHAP scores. Free variables, i, i_1, i_2 are quantified existentially over the set of features \mathcal{F} . The occurrence of some issues implies the occurrence of other issues. I2 is implied by the occurrence I4 and I5.

in the computation of $\mathbf{E}[\kappa]$, which can be done either through counting (when the domains are discrete) or integration (when the domains are real-valued).

Regression – Finite Codomain

We illustrate variants of the known issues of SHAP scores with the explanation problem \mathcal{E}_1 . For an arbitrary $\alpha \neq 0$, Table 3 summarizes the computation of the SHAP scores. As can be concluded, the SHAP score of feature 1 is always 0, and the SHAP score of feature 2 is not 0 (assuming $\alpha \neq 0$). For example, if we pick $\alpha = 1$, we get a (numeric) classification problem with $\mathcal{K} = \{-5, 1, 3\}$. However, we can pick $\alpha = 1/4$, to obtain a regression problem with codomain $\{-1/2, 1, 3/2\}$. In both cases, it is the case that feature 1, which is a relevant feature, has a SHAP score of 0, and feature 2, which is an irrelevant feature, has a non-zero SHAP score.

Although the examples above capture both classification and regression, one can argue that these examples are still somewhat artificial, since the codomain of the regression model consists of a small number of different values, either integer or real-valued. The next section shows how this criticism can be addressed.

Regression – Uncountable Codomain

We now study a regression model containing a non-finite (in fact uncountable) number of values in the codomain of its regression function.

Example 5. (Regression model \mathcal{M}_2 .) We consider a regression problem defined over two real-valued features, taking values from interval $[-1/2, 3/2]$. Thus, we have $\mathcal{F} = \{1, 2\}$, $\mathbb{D}_1 = \mathbb{D}_2 = \mathbb{D} = [-1/2, 3/2]$, $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{D} \times \mathbb{D}$. (We also let $\mathbb{D}^+ = [1/2, 3/2]$ and $\mathbb{D}^- = \mathbb{D} \setminus \mathbb{D}^+$.) In addition, the regression model maps to real values, i.e. $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R}$, and is defined as follows:

$$\rho_2(x_1, x_2) = \begin{cases} x_1 & \text{if } x_1 \in \mathbb{D}^+ \\ x_2 - 2 & \text{if } x_1 \notin \mathbb{D}^+ \wedge x_2 \notin \mathbb{D}^+ \\ x_2 + 1 & \text{if } x_1 \notin \mathbb{D}^+ \wedge x_2 \in \mathbb{D}^+ \end{cases}$$

As a result, the regression model is represented by $\mathcal{M}_2 = (\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{K}, \rho_2)$. Moreover, we assume the target sample to be $(\mathbf{v}_2, q_2) = ((1, 1), 1)$, and so the explanation problem becomes $\mathcal{E}_2 = (\mathcal{M}_2, (\mathbf{v}_2, q_2))$.

Example 6. (AXps, CXps and AExs for \mathcal{E}_2 .) Given the regression model \mathcal{M}_2 , we define the similarity predicate by

\mathcal{S}	\emptyset	$\{1\}$	$\{2\}$	$\{1, 2\}$
$\mathbf{E}[\rho_2(\mathbf{x}) \mid \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}}]$	$1/2$	1	$3/2$	1

Table 5: Expected values of ρ_2 , for each possible set \mathcal{S} of fixed features, and given the sample $((1, 1), 1)$.

picking a suitably small value δ , e.g. $\delta < 1/4$. This suffices to ensure that σ only takes value 1 when feature 1 takes value 1.

Given the above, the similarity predicate takes value 1 only when feature 1 takes value 1, and independently of the value assigned to feature 2.

Thus, fixing feature 1 ensures that the similarity predicate is 1, and so the expected value is 1. Otherwise, if feature 1 is allowed to take a value other than 1, then the similarity predicate can take value 0, and so the expected value is no longer 1. As a result, $\{1\}$ is one (and the only) AXp, and $\{1\}$ is also one (and the only) CXp.

A similar analysis allow concluding that a l_0 -minimal AEx exists iff feature 1 is allowed to take any value from its domain.

Example 7. (SHAP scores for \mathcal{E}_2 .) The expected values of ρ_2 for all possible sets \mathcal{S} of fixed features is shown in Table 5.⁸ Observe that these values correspond exactly to the expected values shown in Table 1 when $\alpha = 1/2$. Hence, the computation of SHAP scores is the one shown in Table 3 by setting $\alpha = 1/2$, and so $\text{Sc}_E(1) = 0$ and $\text{Sc}_E(2) = 1/2$.

The above examples demonstrate that one can construct a regression model for which the computed SHAP scores will be misleading, assigning importance to a feature having no influence in the prediction, and assigning no important to a feature having complete influence in the prediction.

Given the above, this section proves the following result.

Proposition 7. There exist regression models, with an uncountable codomain, for which each feature i is either irrelevant and its SHAP score is non-zero or the feature is relevant and its SHAP score is zero.

Nevertheless, the previous example is also open to criticism because the regression function is not continuous. Continuity is an important aspect of some ML models, such that in recent years Lipschitz continuity has been exploited to ensure the adversarial robustness of ML models. Thus, one ad-

⁸The computation of these expected values is fairly straightforward, and is summarized in the supplemental materials.

ditional challenge is whether regression models respecting Lipschitz continuity (and so plain continuity) can produce unsatisfactory SHAP scores. The next section addresses this challenge.

Regression – Lipschitz Continuity

The examples studied in the earlier sections expand significantly the range of ML models for which unsatisfactory can be produced. However, a major source of criticism is that these ML models are not continuous.

We now discuss a *family* of continuous ML models, that also produce unsatisfactory SHAP scores. We will then argue that the proposed family of ML models also ensures Lipschitz continuity.

Example 8. We consider a regression problem defined over two real-valued features, taking values from interval $[0, 2]$. Thus, we have $\mathcal{F} = \{1, 2\}$, $\mathbb{D}_1 = \mathbb{D}_2 = \mathbb{D} = [0, 2]$, $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{D} \times \mathbb{D}$. In addition, the regression model maps to real values, i.e. $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R}$, and is defined as shown in Figure 2. The value is such that $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$. As a result, the regression model is represented by $\mathcal{M}_3 = (\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{K}, \rho_3)$. Moreover, we assume the target sample to be $(\mathbf{v}_3, q_3) = ((1, 1), 1)$, and so the explanation problem becomes $\mathcal{E}_3 = (\mathcal{M}, (\mathbf{v}_3, q_3))$.

By inspection, it is plain that ρ_3 is continuous; this is further discussed below.

Example 9. (AXps, CXps and AExs for \mathcal{E}_3 .) As before, it is plain to reach the conclusion that the set of AXps is $\{\{1\}\}$, and this is also the set of CXps. Moreover, and as before, there is a l_0 -minimal AEx containing feature 1.

Example 10. (SHAP scores for \mathcal{E}_3 .) The regression model \mathcal{M}_3 is devised such that the expected values of ρ_3 for each possible set \mathcal{S} of fixed features are exactly the ones shown in Table 1. As a result, the computed SHAP scores are the same as before, and so they are again unsatisfactory.

Given the above, this section proves the following result.

Proposition 8. There exist regression models, respecting Lipschitz continuity, for which each feature i is either irrelevant and its SHAP score is non-zero or the feature is relevant and its SHAP score is zero.

Finally, it is simple to prove that ρ_3 is Lipschitz-continuous. The proof is included in the supplemental materials. Also, the continuity of ρ_3 (claimed above) is implied by the fact that ρ_3 Lipschitz-continuous.

Regression – Arbitrary Differentiability

This section argues that the issues with SHAP scores can be identified even when regression models are arbitrary differentiable.⁹ We provide a simple argument below.¹⁰

To devise an arbitrary differentiable regression model, we use ρ_3 (see Figure 2) and the guiding example. The main insight is to take the rectangle $[1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon][0, 2]$ with (a

⁹It is well-known that differentiability does not imply Lipschitz continuity. Hence, we consider the two cases separately.

¹⁰The actual construction of the regression model becomes somewhat more cumbersome, and so we just give the rationale for constructing the model.

very small) $\epsilon > 0$. In this rectangle, we replace the function by polynomials on x_1 with the same value on $\{1\}[0, 2]$, on $\{1 - \epsilon\}[0, 2]$ and on $\{1 + \epsilon\}[0, 2]$ (the dependence on x_2 remains unchanged, we still have a polynomial on x_1 for $x_2 \in [0, 1]$, another one for $x_2 = 2$ and the polynomial for $x_2 \in [1, 2]$ is given by $2 - x_2$ times the former plus $x_2 - 1$ times the latter like for left and right sides) plus we also fix the value of the n first derivatives on x_1 for $x_1 \in \{1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon\}$. As these are $3 + 2n$ (with n being the number of times the counter-example will be derivable) constraints, it is possible with infinitely many $3 + 2n$ degree polynomials (exactly one of them will be degree $2 + 2n$ or less but it is not necessarily the one that interest us) so we can do it for every n . Now in these infinitely many polynomials, we pick the one with the same average value on the rectangle of the original function, we can do it because we only fixed part of relative size 0 so in these polynomials there are every average value in \mathbb{R} (we can also fix the fact that $\rho > 1$ if $x_1 > 1$ and $\rho < 1$ if $x_1 < 1$ with higher non-controlled degree if necessary). The same can be done with the other non-derivable line as the conditions are the same. Then we have a new function with n -times derivability and lipschitz that still have the same properties.

Given the above, this section proves the following result.

Proposition 9. There exist regression models, that are arbitrarily differentiable, for which each feature i is either irrelevant and its SHAP score is non-zero or the feature is relevant and its SHAP score is zero.

Conclusions

SHAP scores find an ever-increasing range of uses in XAI. However, recent work demonstrated that the exact computation of SHAP scores can yield thoroughly unsatisfactory results (Huang and Marques-Silva 2023), in the concrete case of ML classifiers. Building on this earlier work, this paper demonstrates that the limitations identified in the case of ML classifiers can be reproduced in far more general settings, that include regression models, but also regression models that respect Lipschitz continuity. As a result, even for ML models that respect Lipschitz continuity, and so respect a well-known criterion for adversarial robustness, SHAP scores are shown to be unsatisfactory.

The paper also argues that similar examples of regression models that yield unsatisfactory results can be obtained for C^∞ functions. In light of earlier results, but also the new results demonstrated in this paper, for the most widely used ML models there exist examples for which computed SHAP scores will be entirely unsatisfactory. This further justifies alternative measures of feature importance (Biradar et al. 2024). Finally, recent work have outline mechanisms for correcting SHAP scores as well as relating them with other alternatives (Letoffe, Huang, and Marques-Silva 2024; Letoffe et al. 2024).

References

Arenas, M.; Barceló, P.; Bertossi, L. E.; and Monet, M. 2021. The Tractability of SHAP-Score-Based Explana-

$$\rho_3(x_1, x_2) = \begin{cases} x_1 & \text{if } x_2 \leq 1 \wedge \alpha x_1 \leq \alpha \\ (1 + 4|\alpha|)x_1 - 4|\alpha| & \text{if } x_2 \leq 1 \wedge \alpha x_1 \geq \alpha \\ 28|\alpha|x_1x_2 + (1 - 28|\alpha|)x_1 - 28|\alpha|x_2 + 28|\alpha| & \text{if } x_2 \geq 1 \wedge \alpha x_1 \leq \alpha \\ -4|\alpha|x_1x_2 + (1 + 8|\alpha|)x_1 + 4|\alpha|x_2 - 8|\alpha| & \text{if } x_2 \geq 1 \wedge \alpha x_1 \geq \alpha \end{cases}$$

Figure 2: Example of regression model that is Lipschitz continuous.

tions for Classification over Deterministic and Decomposable Boolean Circuits. In *AAAI*, 6670–6678.

Arenas, M.; Barceló, P.; Bertossi, L. E.; and Monet, M. 2023. On the Complexity of SHAP-Score-Based Explanations: Tractability via Knowledge Compilation and Non-Approximability Results. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 24: 63:1–63:58.

Biradar, G.; Izza, Y.; Lobo, E.; Viswanathan, V.; and Zick, Y. 2024. Axiomatic Aggregations of Abductive Explanations. *CoRR*, abs/2310.03131.

Biradar, G.; Izza, Y.; Lobo, E.; Viswanathan, V.; and Zick, Y. 2024. Axiomatic Aggregations of Abductive Explanations. In *AAAI*, 11096–11104.

Brix, C.; Müller, M. N.; Bak, S.; Johnson, T. T.; and Liu, C. 2023. First three years of the international verification of neural networks competition (VNN-COMP). *Int. J. Softw. Tools Technol. Transf.*, 25(3): 329–339.

Cranko, Z.; Shi, Z.; Zhang, X.; Nock, R.; and Kornblith, S. 2021. Generalised Lipschitz Regularisation Equals Distributional Robustness. In *ICML*, 2178–2188.

Darwiche, A. 2023. Logic for Explainable AI. In *LICS*, 1–11.

Dubey, P. 1975. On the uniqueness of the Shapley value. *International Journal of Game Theory*, 4: 131–139.

European Union. 2024. Artificial Intelligence Act. <https://tinyurl.com/yj2zv67w>.

Fazlyab, M.; Robey, A.; Hassani, H.; Morari, M.; and Pappas, G. J. 2019. Efficient and Accurate Estimation of Lipschitz Constants for Deep Neural Networks. In *NeurIPS*, 11423–11434.

Goodfellow, I. J.; Shlens, J.; and Szegedy, C. 2015. Explaining and Harnessing Adversarial Examples. In *ICLR*.

Hanspal, H.; and Lomuscio, A. 2023. Efficient Verification of Neural Networks Against LVM-Based Specifications. In *CVPR*, 3894–3903.

Havens, A. J.; Araujo, A.; Garg, S.; Khorrami, F.; and Hu, B. 2023. Exploiting Connections between Lipschitz Structures for Certifiably Robust Deep Equilibrium Models. In *NeurIPS*.

Hein, M.; and Andriushchenko, M. 2017. Formal Guarantees on the Robustness of a Classifier against Adversarial Manipulation. In *NeurIPS*, 2266–2276.

High-Level Expert Group on AI. 2019. Ethics guidelines for trustworthy AI. <https://tinyurl.com/yyzwmm79>.

Huang, X.; and Marques-Silva, J. 2023. The Inadequacy of Shapley Values for Explainability. *CoRR*, abs/2302.08160.

Huang, Y.; Zhang, H.; Shi, Y.; Kolter, J. Z.; and Anandkumar, A. 2021. Training Certifiably Robust Neural Networks

with Efficient Local Lipschitz Bounds. In *NeurIPS*, 22745–22757.

Ignatiev, A.; Narodytska, N.; and Marques-Silva, J. 2019. On Relating Explanations and Adversarial Examples. In *NeurIPS*, 15857–15867.

James, G.; Witten, D.; Hastie, T.; and Tibshirani, R. 2017. *An introduction to statistical learning*. Springer.

Janzing, D.; Minorics, L.; and Blöbaum, P. 2020. Feature relevance quantification in explainable AI: A causal problem. In *AISTATS*, 2907–2916.

Jordan, M.; and Dimakis, A. G. 2020. Exactly Computing the Local Lipschitz Constant of ReLU Networks. In *NeurIPS*.

Kumar, I.; Scheidegger, C.; Venkatasubramanian, S.; and Friedler, S. A. 2021. Shapley Residuals: Quantifying the limits of the Shapley value for explanations. In *NeurIPS*, 26598–26608.

Kumar, I. E.; Venkatasubramanian, S.; Scheidegger, C.; and Friedler, S. A. 2020. Problems with Shapley-value-based explanations as feature importance measures. In *ICML*, 5491–5500.

Letoffe, O.; Huang, X.; Asher, N.; and Marques-Silva, J. 2024. From SHAP Scores to Feature Importance Scores. *CoRR*, abs/2405.11766.

Letoffe, O.; Huang, X.; and Marques-Silva, J. 2024. On Correcting SHAP Scores. *CoRR*, abs/2405.00076.

Lundberg, S. M.; and Lee, S. 2017. A Unified Approach to Interpreting Model Predictions. In *NeurIPS*, 4765–4774.

Marques-Silva, J.; and Ignatiev, A. 2022. Delivering Trustworthy AI through Formal XAI. In *AAAI*, 12342–12350.

Mishra, P. 2023. *Explainable AI Recipes*. Apress. ISBN 978-1-4842-9029-3.

Molnar, C. 2023. *Interpreting Machine Learning Models With SHAP*. Lulu.com. ISBN 979-8857734445.

O’Searcoid, M. 2006. *Metric spaces*. Springer Science & Business Media.

Pauli, P.; Koch, A.; Berberich, J.; Kohler, P.; and Allgöwer, F. 2022. Training Robust Neural Networks Using Lipschitz Bounds. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 6: 121–126.

Roth, A. E. 1988. *The Shapley value: essays in honor of Lloyd S. Shapley*. Cambridge University Press.

Shapley, L. S. 1953. A value for n -person games. *Contributions to the Theory of Games*, 2(28): 307–317.

Strumbelj, E.; and Kononenko, I. 2010. An Efficient Explanation of Individual Classifications using Game Theory. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 11: 1–18.

Strumbelj, E.; and Kononenko, I. 2014. Explaining prediction models and individual predictions with feature contributions. *Knowl. Inf. Syst.*, 41(3): 647–665.

Sundararajan, M.; and Najmi, A. 2020. The Many Shapley Values for Model Explanation. In *ICML*, 9269–9278.

Szegedy, C.; Zaremba, W.; Sutskever, I.; Bruna, J.; Erhan, D.; Goodfellow, I. J.; and Fergus, R. 2014. Intriguing properties of neural networks. In *ICLR*.

US Government. 2023. Executive Order on the Safe, Secure, and Trustworthy Development and Use of Artificial Intelligence. <https://tinyurl.com/yb7wcmen>.

Van den Broeck, G.; Lykov, A.; Schleich, M.; and Suciu, D. 2021. On the Tractability of SHAP Explanations. In *AAAI*, 6505–6513.

Van den Broeck, G.; Lykov, A.; Schleich, M.; and Suciu, D. 2022. On the Tractability of SHAP Explanations. *J. Artif. Intell. Res.*, 74: 851–886.

Virmaux, A.; and Scaman, K. 2018. Lipschitz regularity of deep neural networks: analysis and efficient estimation. In *NeurIPS*, 3839–3848.

Wäldchen, S.; MacDonald, J.; Hauch, S.; and Kutyniok, G. 2021. The Computational Complexity of Understanding Binary Classifier Decisions. *J. Artif. Intell. Res.*, 70: 351–387.

Weng, T.; Zhang, H.; Chen, P.; Yi, J.; Su, D.; Gao, Y.; Hsieh, C.; and Daniel, L. 2018. Evaluating the Robustness of Neural Networks: An Extreme Value Theory Approach. In *ICLR*.

Wu, M.; Wu, H.; and Barrett, C. W. 2023. VeriX: Towards Verified Explainability of Deep Neural Networks. In *NeurIPS*.

Young, H. P. 1985. Monotonic solutions of cooperative games. *International Journal of Game Theory*, 14: 65–72.

Yu, J.; Farr, G.; Ignatiev, A.; and Stuckey, P. J. 2023. Anytime Approximate Formal Feature Attribution. *CoRR*, abs/2312.06973.

Yu, J.; Ignatiev, A.; and Stuckey, P. J. 2023. On Formal Feature Attribution and Its Approximation. *CoRR*, abs/2307.03380.

Zhang, B.; Jiang, D.; He, D.; and Wang, L. 2022. Rethinking Lipschitz Neural Networks and Certified Robustness: A Boolean Function Perspective. In *NeurIPS*.

Supplemental Materials

Proofs for Propositions in Classification – Boolean Domains

Proposition 1. For any $n \geq 3$, there exist boolean functions defined on n variables, and at least one sample, which exhibit an issue I1, i.e. there exists an irrelevant feature $i \in \mathcal{F}$, such that $\text{Sc}_E(i) \neq 0$.

Proof. Let \mathcal{M} be a classifier defined on the feature set \mathcal{F} and characterized by the function defined as follows:

$$\kappa(\mathbf{x}_{1..m}, x_n) := \begin{cases} \kappa_1(\mathbf{x}_{1..m}) \vee f(\mathbf{x}_{1..m}) & \text{if } x_n = 0 \\ \kappa_1(\mathbf{x}_{1..m}) & \text{if } x_n = 1 \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

The non-constant sub-functions κ_1 and f are defined on the feature set $\mathcal{F} \setminus \{n\}$, and satisfy the following conditions:

1. $\kappa_1 \neq \kappa_1 \vee f$ and $\kappa_1 \wedge f = 0$.
2. Both κ_1 and $\kappa_1 \vee f$ predict a specific point $\mathbf{v}_{1..m}$ to 0.
3. The set of CXps for both κ_1 and $\kappa_1 \vee f$ with respect to the point $\mathbf{v}_{1..m}$ are identical.

Choose this specific m -dimensional point $\mathbf{v}_{1..m}$ and extend it with $v_n = 1$. This means $\kappa_0(\mathbf{v}) = \kappa_1(\mathbf{v}) = 0$, and therefore $\kappa(\mathbf{v}) = 0$. For any $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{F} \setminus \{n\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_n(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{E}, v_e) &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot (\mathbf{E}[\kappa_1 | \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}}] - \mathbf{E}[(\kappa_1 \vee f) | \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}}]) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot (\mathbf{E}[\kappa_1 | \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}}] - \mathbf{E}[\kappa_1 | \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}}] - \mathbf{E}[f | \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}}]) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot (-\mathbf{E}[f | \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}}]), \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

we can infer that $-\mathbf{E}[f | \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}}] < 0$ for some \mathcal{S} , which implies $\text{Sc}_E(n) < 0$.

To prove that feature n is irrelevant, we assume the contrary that feature n is relevant, and \mathcal{X} , where $n \in \mathcal{X}$, is an AXp of the point \mathbf{v} . Based on the definition of AXp, we only include points \mathbf{x} for which $\kappa_1(\mathbf{x}) = 0$ holds. As κ_1 and $\kappa_1 \vee f$ share the same set of CXps, they have the same set of AXps. This means $\mathcal{X} \setminus \{n\}$ will not include any points \mathbf{x} such that either $\kappa_1(\mathbf{x}) \neq 0$ or $(\kappa_1 \vee f)(\mathbf{x}) \neq 0$ holds. This means $\mathcal{X} \setminus \{n\}$ remains an AXp of the point \mathbf{v} , leading to a contradiction. Thus, feature n is irrelevant. \square

Proposition 2. For any odd $n \geq 3$, there exist boolean functions defined on n variables, and at least one sample, which exhibits an issue I3, i.e. there exists a relevant feature $i \in \mathcal{F}$, such that $\text{Sc}_E(i) = 0$.

Proof. Let \mathcal{M} be a classifier defined on the feature set \mathcal{F} and characterized by the function defined as follows:

$$\kappa(\mathbf{x}_{1..m}, \mathbf{x}_{m+1..2m}, x_n) := \begin{cases} \kappa_0(\mathbf{x}_{1..m}) & \text{if } x_n = 0 \\ \kappa_1(\mathbf{x}_{m+1..2m}) & \text{if } x_n = 1 \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

The non-constant sub-functions κ_0 and κ_1 are defined on the feature sets $\mathcal{F}_0 = \{1, \dots, m\}$ and $\mathcal{F}_1 = \{m+1, \dots, 2m\}$, respectively. It is important to note that κ_0 is independent of κ_1 as \mathcal{F}_0 and \mathcal{F}_1 are disjoint. Moreover, κ_0 and κ_1 are identical up to isomorphism. (For simplicity, we assume that feature i corresponds to feature $m+i$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$.)

Choose a n -dimensional point \mathbf{v} such that: 1) $v_n = 1$, 2) $v_i = v_{m+i}$ for any $1 \leq i \leq m$, and 3) $\kappa_0(\mathbf{v}) = \kappa_1(\mathbf{v}) = 1$. This means $\kappa(\mathbf{v}) = 1$. For any $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{F} \setminus \{n\}$ such that $\mathcal{S} \neq \emptyset$, let $\{\mathcal{S}_0, \mathcal{S}_1\}$ be a partition of \mathcal{S} such that $\mathcal{S}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{F}_0$ and $\mathcal{S}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{F}_1$, then

$$\Delta_n(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{E}, v_e) = \frac{1}{2} \cdot (\mathbf{E}[\kappa_1 | \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}_1} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}_1}] - \mathbf{E}[\kappa_0 | \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}_0} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}_0}]). \quad (18)$$

For any $\{\mathcal{S}_0, \mathcal{S}_1\}$, we can construct a unique new partition $\{\mathcal{S}'_0, \mathcal{S}'_1\}$ by replacing any $i \in \mathcal{S}_0$ with $m+i$ and any $m+i \in \mathcal{S}_1$ with i . Let $\mathcal{S}' = \mathcal{S}'_0 \cup \mathcal{S}'_1$, then we have

$$\Delta_n(\mathcal{S}'; \mathcal{E}, v_e) = \frac{1}{2} \cdot (\mathbf{E}[\kappa_1 | \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}'_0} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}'_0}] - \mathbf{E}[\kappa_0 | \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}'_1} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}'_1}]). \quad (19)$$

Besides, we have $\mathbf{E}[\kappa_1 | \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}_1} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}_1}] = \mathbf{E}[\kappa_0 | \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}'_1} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}'_1}]$ and $\mathbf{E}[\kappa_0 | \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}_0} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}_0}] = \mathbf{E}[\kappa_1 | \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}'_0} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}'_0}]$, which means

$$\Delta_n(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{E}, v_e) = -\Delta_n(\mathcal{S}'; \mathcal{E}, v_e), \quad (20)$$

note that $\zeta(\mathcal{S}) = \zeta(\mathcal{S}')$. Hence, for any $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{F} \setminus \{n\}$ such that $\mathcal{S} \neq \emptyset$, there is a unique \mathcal{S}' that can cancel its effect. Besides, if $\mathcal{S} = \emptyset$ or $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{F} \setminus \{n\}$, then we have $\Delta_n(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{E}, v_e) = 0$. We can derive that $\text{Sc}_E(n) = 0$. However, n is a relevant feature. To prove this, it is evident that $\mathcal{F} \setminus \mathcal{F}_0$ represents a weak AXp. Moreover, $\mathcal{F} \setminus (\mathcal{F}_0 \cup \{n\})$ is not a weak AXp because allowing x_n to take the value 0 will include points \mathbf{x} such that $\kappa_0(\mathbf{x}) \neq 1$. Hence, there are AXps containing feature n . \square

Proposition 3. For any even $n \geq 4$, there exist boolean functions defined on n variables, and at least one sample, which exhibits an issue I4, i.e. there exists an irrelevant feature $i_1 \in \mathcal{F}$, such that $\text{Sc}_E(i_1) \neq 0$, and a relevant feature $i_2 \in \mathcal{F} \setminus \{i_1\}$, such that $\text{Sc}_E(i_2) = 0$.

Proof. Let \mathcal{M} be a classifier defined on the feature set \mathcal{F} and characterized by the function defined as follows:

$$\kappa(\mathbf{x}_{1..m}, \mathbf{x}_{m+1..2m}, x_{n-1}, x_n) := \begin{cases} \kappa_{00}(\mathbf{x}_{1..m}) & \text{if } x_n = 0 \wedge x_{n-1} = 0 \\ \kappa_{01}(\mathbf{x}_{m+1..2m}) & \text{if } x_n = 0 \wedge x_{n-1} = 1 \\ \kappa_0(\mathbf{x}_{1..2m}, x_{n-1}) \vee f(\mathbf{x}_{1..2m}) & \text{if } x_n = 1 \end{cases} \quad (21)$$

The non-constant sub-functions κ_{00} , κ_{01} and f are defined on the feature sets $\mathcal{F}_0 = \{1, \dots, m\}$, $\mathcal{F}_1 = \{m+1, \dots, 2m\}$, and $\mathcal{F} \setminus \{n-1, n\}$, respectively. It is worth noting that κ_{00} is independent of κ_{01} as \mathcal{F}_0 and \mathcal{F}_1 are disjoint. Also note that $\kappa_1 = \kappa_0 \vee f$. Moreover, κ_{00} , κ_{01} and f satisfy the following conditions:

1. κ_{00} and κ_{01} are identical up to isomorphism. (For simplicity, we assume that feature i corresponds to feature $m+i$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$.)
2. $\kappa_0 \neq \kappa_0 \vee f$, $\kappa_{00} \wedge f = 0$ and $\kappa_{01} \wedge f = 0$.
3. Both κ_0 and $\kappa_0 \vee f$ predict a specific point $\mathbf{v}_{1..n-1}$ to 1, where $v_{n-1} = 1$, and $v_i = v_{m+i}$ for any $1 \leq i \leq m$.
4. The set of CXps for κ_0 and $\kappa_0 \vee f$ with respect to the point $\mathbf{v}_{1..n-1}$ are identical.

Choose this specific $n-1$ -dimensional point $\mathbf{v}_{1..n-1}$ and extend it with $v_n = 1$, then $\kappa_0(\mathbf{v}) = \kappa_1(\mathbf{v}) = 1$ and $\kappa(\mathbf{v}) = 1$. For any $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{F} \setminus \{n\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_n(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{E}, v_e) &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot (\mathbf{E}[(\kappa_0 \vee f)|\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}}] - \mathbf{E}[\kappa_0|\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}}]) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot (\mathbf{E}[f|\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}}]), \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

which implies $\text{Sc}_E(n) > 0$. As κ_0 and $\kappa_0 \vee f$ share the same set of CXps, they have the same set of AXps. By applying similar reasoning as presented in the proof of Proposition 1, we can conclude that feature n is irrelevant. For any $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{F} \setminus \{n-1, n\}$ such that $\mathcal{S} \neq \emptyset$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{n-1}(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{E}, v_e) &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{2} \cdot (\mathbf{E}[\kappa_{01}|\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}}] - \mathbf{E}[\kappa_{00}|\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}}]) + \frac{1}{2} \cdot (\mathbf{E}[\kappa_{11}|\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}}] - \mathbf{E}[\kappa_{10}|\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}}]) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot (\mathbf{E}[\kappa_{01}|\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}}] - \mathbf{E}[\kappa_{00}|\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}}]), \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

besides, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{n-1}(\mathcal{S} \cup \{n\}; \mathcal{E}, v_e) &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot (\mathbf{E}[\kappa_{11}|\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}}] - \mathbf{E}[\kappa_{10}|\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}}]) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot (\mathbf{E}[\kappa_{01}|\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}}] - \mathbf{E}[\kappa_{00}|\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}}]), \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

also note that $\Delta_{n-1}(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{E}, v_e) = 0$ when $\mathcal{S} = \emptyset$ or $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{F} \setminus \{n-1\}$. By applying the same reasoning as presented in the proof of Proposition 2, for any \mathcal{S} , there is a unique \mathcal{S}' such that $|\mathcal{S}| = |\mathcal{S}'|$ to cancel the effect of \mathcal{S} . Thus, we can conclude that $\text{Sc}_E(n-1) = 0$ but feature $n-1$ is relevant. \square

Proposition 4. For any $n \geq 4$, there exists boolean functions defined on n variables, and at least one sample, which exhibits an issue I5, i.e. there exists an irrelevant feature $i \in \mathcal{F}$, such that $|\text{Sc}_E(i)| = \max\{|\text{Sc}_E(j)| \mid j \in \mathcal{F}\}$.

Proof. Let \mathcal{M} be a classifier defined on the feature set \mathcal{F} and characterized by the function defined as follows:

$$\kappa(\mathbf{x}_{1..m}, x_n) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x_n = 0 \\ \kappa_1(\mathbf{x}_{1..m}) & \text{if } x_n = 1 \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

Its sub-function κ_1 is a non-constant function defined on the feature set $\mathcal{F} \setminus \{n\}$, and satisfies the following conditions:

1. κ_1 predicts a specific point $\mathbf{v}_{1..m}$ to 0.
2. For any point $\mathbf{x}_{1..m}$ such that $\|\mathbf{x}_{1..m} - \mathbf{v}_{1..m}\|_0 = 1$, we have $\kappa_1(\mathbf{x}_{1..m}) = 1$.
3. κ_1 predicts all the other points to 0.

For example, κ_1 can be the function $\sum_{i=1}^m \neg x_i = 1$, which predicts the point $\mathbf{1}_{1..m}$ to 0 and all points around this point with a Hamming distance of 1 to 1.

Select this specific m -dimensional point $\mathbf{v}_{1..m}$ such that $\kappa_1(\mathbf{v}_{1..m}) = 0$. Extend $\mathbf{v}_{1..m}$ with $v_n = 1$, we have $\kappa(\mathbf{v}) = 0$. To prove that the feature n is irrelevant, we assume the contrary that the feature n is relevant, and \mathcal{X} , where $n \in \mathcal{X}$, is an AXp of the point \mathbf{v} . Based on the definition of AXp, we only include points \mathbf{x} for which $\kappa_1(\mathbf{x}) = 0$ holds. However, as $\kappa_0 = 0$, $\mathcal{X} \setminus \{n\}$ will not include any points \mathbf{x} such that either $\kappa_0(\mathbf{x}) \neq 0$ or $\kappa_1(\mathbf{x}) \neq 0$ holds. This means $\mathcal{X} \setminus \{n\}$ remains an AXp of the point \mathbf{v} , leading to a contradiction. Thus, feature n is irrelevant. In addition, for κ_1 and any $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{F} \setminus \{n\}$, we have

$$\mathbf{E}[\kappa_1|\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}}] = \frac{m - |\mathcal{S}|}{2^{m-|\mathcal{S}|}}. \quad (26)$$

For feature n and an arbitrary $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$, we have

$$\Delta_n(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{E}, v_e) = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{m - |\mathcal{S}|}{2^{m-|\mathcal{S}|}}, \quad (27)$$

this means $\text{Sc}_E(n) > 0$. Besides, the unique minimal value of $\Delta_n(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{E}, v_e)$ is 0 when $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{F} \setminus \{n\}$.

We now focus on a feature $j \neq n$. Consider an arbitrary $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{F} \setminus \{j, n\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_j(\mathcal{S} \cup \{n\}; \mathcal{E}, v_e) &= \frac{m - |\mathcal{S}| - 1}{2^{m-|\mathcal{S}|-1}} - \frac{m - |\mathcal{S}|}{2^{m-|\mathcal{S}|}} \\ &= \frac{m - |\mathcal{S}| - 2}{2^{m-|\mathcal{S}|}}. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

In this case, $\Delta_j(\mathcal{S} \cup \{n\}; \mathcal{E}, v_e) = -\frac{1}{2}$ if $|\mathcal{S}| = m-1$, which is its unique minimal value. $\Delta_j(\mathcal{S} \cup \{n\}; \mathcal{E}, v_e) = 0$ if $|\mathcal{S}| = m-2$, and $\Delta_j(\mathcal{S} \cup \{n\}; \mathcal{E}, v_e) > 0$ if $|\mathcal{S}| < m-2$. Besides, we have

$$\Delta_j(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{E}, v_e) = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{m - |\mathcal{S}| - 2}{2^{m-|\mathcal{S}|}}. \quad (29)$$

In this case, $\Delta_j(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{E}, v_e) = -\frac{1}{4}$ if $|\mathcal{S}| = m-1$, which is its unique minimal value. $\Delta_j(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{E}, v_e) = 0$ if $|\mathcal{S}| = m-2$, and $\Delta_j(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{E}, v_e) > 0$ if $|\mathcal{S}| < m-2$.

Next, we prove $|\text{Sc}_E(n)| > |\text{Sc}_E(j)|$ by showing $\text{Sc}_E(n) + \text{Sc}_E(j) > 0$ and $\text{Sc}_E(n) - \text{Sc}_E(j) > 0$. Note that $\text{Sc}_E(n) > 0$. Additionally, $\Delta_j(\mathcal{S} \cup \{n\}; \mathcal{E}, v_e) < 0$ and $\Delta_j(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{E}, v_e) < 0$ only when $|\mathcal{S}| = m-1$. Compute the SHAP score for feature n :

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Sc}_E(n) &= \sum_{\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{F} \setminus \{n\}} \frac{|\mathcal{S}|!(m-|\mathcal{S}|)!}{(m+1)!} \cdot \Delta_n(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{E}, v_e) \\ &= \sum_{\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{F} \setminus \{n\}} \frac{|\mathcal{S}|!(m-|\mathcal{S}|)!}{(m+1)!} \cdot \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{m-|\mathcal{S}|}{2^{m-|\mathcal{S}|}} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{m+1} \cdot \sum_{\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{F} \setminus \{n\}} \frac{|\mathcal{S}|!(m-|\mathcal{S}|)!}{m!} \cdot \frac{m-|\mathcal{S}|}{2^{m-|\mathcal{S}|}} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{m+1} \cdot \sum_{0 \leq |\mathcal{S}| \leq m} \frac{|\mathcal{S}|!(m-|\mathcal{S}|)!}{m!} \cdot \frac{m!}{|\mathcal{S}|!(m-|\mathcal{S}|)!} \cdot \frac{m-|\mathcal{S}|}{2^{m-|\mathcal{S}|}} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{m+1} \cdot \sum_{k=0}^m \frac{k}{2^k} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{m+1} \cdot \frac{2^{m+1} - m - 2}{2^m} \\ &= \frac{1}{m+1} \cdot \frac{2^{m+1} - m - 2}{2^{m+1}}. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Now we focus on a feature $j \neq n$. Consider the subset $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{F} \setminus \{j, n\}$ where $|\mathcal{S}| = m-1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{|\mathcal{S} \cup \{n\}|!(m-|\mathcal{S} \cup \{n\}|)!}{(m+1)!} \cdot \frac{m-|\mathcal{S}|-2}{2^{m-|\mathcal{S}|}} \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{m+1}, \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{|\mathcal{S}|!(m-|\mathcal{S}|)!}{(m+1)!} \cdot \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{m-|\mathcal{S}|-2}{2^{m-|\mathcal{S}|}} \\ &= -\frac{1}{4} \cdot \frac{1}{m(m+1)}. \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

The sum of these three values is

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{m+1} \cdot \frac{2^{m+1} - m - 2}{2^{m+1}} - \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{m+1} - \frac{1}{4} \cdot \frac{1}{m(m+1)} \\ &= \frac{1}{m+1} \cdot \left(\frac{(2^{m+1} - m - 2)m}{m2^{m+1}} - \frac{m2^m}{m2^{m+1}} - \frac{2^{m-1}}{m2^{m+1}} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{m(m+1)2^{m+1}} \cdot \left((m - \frac{1}{2})2^m - m^2 - 2m \right), \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

since $m \geq 3$, the sum of these three values is always greater than 0. Thus, we can conclude that $\text{Sc}_E(n) + \text{Sc}_E(j) > 0$.

To show $\text{Sc}_E(n) - \text{Sc}_E(j) > 0$, we focus on all $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{F} \setminus \{n\}$ where $|\mathcal{S}| < m-2$. This is because, as previously stated,

$\Delta_j(\mathcal{S} \cup \{n\}; \mathcal{E}, v_e) \leq 0$ and $\Delta_j(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{E}, v_e) \leq 0$ if $|\mathcal{S}| \geq m - 2$.

Moreover, for all $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{F} \setminus \{n\}$ where $|\mathcal{S}| = k$ and $0 < k \leq m - 3$, we compute the following three quantities:

$$\begin{aligned} Q_1 &:= \sum_{\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{F} \setminus \{n\}, |\mathcal{S}|=k} \Delta_n(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{E}, v_e), \\ Q_2 &:= \sum_{\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{F} \setminus \{j, n\}, |\mathcal{S}|=k-1} \Delta_j(\mathcal{S} \cup \{n\}; \mathcal{E}, v_e), \\ Q_3 &:= \sum_{\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{F} \setminus \{j, n\}, |\mathcal{S}|=k} \Delta_j(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{E}, v_e), \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

and show that $Q_1 - Q_2 - Q_3 > 0$. Note that Q_1, Q_2 and Q_3 share the same coefficient $\frac{k!(n-k-1)!}{n!}$. For feature n , we pick all possible $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{F} \setminus \{n\}$ where $|\mathcal{S}| = k$, which implies $|\mathcal{S} \cup \{n\}| = k + 1$, then

$$Q_1 = \binom{m}{|\mathcal{S}|} \cdot \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{m - |\mathcal{S}|}{2^{m-|\mathcal{S}|}} = \binom{m}{k} \cdot \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{m - k}{2^{m-k}}. \quad (35)$$

For a feature $j \neq n$. We pick all possible $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{F} \setminus \{j, n\}$ where $|\mathcal{S}| = k - 1$, which implies $|\mathcal{S} \cup \{j, n\}| = k + 1$, then

$$Q_2 = \binom{m-1}{|\mathcal{S}|} \cdot \frac{m - |\mathcal{S}| - 2}{2^{m-|\mathcal{S}|}} = \binom{m-1}{k-1} \cdot \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{m - k - 1}{2^{m-k}}. \quad (36)$$

We pick all possible $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{F} \setminus \{j, n\}$ where $|\mathcal{S}| = k$, which implies $|\mathcal{S} \cup \{j\}| = k + 1$, then

$$Q_3 = \binom{m-1}{|\mathcal{S}|} \cdot \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{m - |\mathcal{S}| - 2}{2^{m-|\mathcal{S}|}} = \binom{m-1}{k} \cdot \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{m - k - 2}{2^{m-k}}. \quad (37)$$

Then we compute $Q_1 - Q_2 - Q_3$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \binom{m}{k} \cdot \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{m - k}{2^{m-k}} - \binom{m-1}{k-1} \cdot \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{m - k - 1}{2^{m-k}} - \binom{m-1}{k} \cdot \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{m - k - 2}{2^{m-k}} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{2^{m-k}} \left[\binom{m}{k} (m - k) - \binom{m-1}{k-1} (m - k - 1) - \binom{m-1}{k} (m - k - 2) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{2^{m-k}} \left[\binom{m-1}{k-1} + 2 \binom{m-1}{k} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

this means that $\text{Sc}_E(n) - \text{Sc}_E(j) > 0$. Hence, we can conclude that $|\text{Sc}_E(n)| > |\text{Sc}_E(j)|$. \square

Proposition 5. For any $n \geq 4$, there exist functions defined on n variables, and at least one sample, which exhibits an issue I6, i.e. there exists an irrelevant feature $i_1 \in \mathcal{F}$, and a relevant feature $i_2 \in \mathcal{F} \setminus \{i_1\}$, such that $\text{Sc}_E(i_1) \times \text{Sc}_E(i_2) > 0$.

Proof. Let \mathcal{M} be a classifier defined on the feature set \mathcal{F} and characterized by the function defined as follows:

$$\kappa(\mathbf{x}_{1..m}, x_{n-1}, x_n) := \begin{cases} \kappa'(\mathbf{x}_{1..m}) & \text{if } x_n = 0 \wedge x_{n-1} = 0 \\ \kappa'(\mathbf{x}_{1..m}) \vee f(\mathbf{x}_{1..m}) & \text{if } x_n = 0 \wedge x_{n-1} = 1 \\ \kappa'(\mathbf{x}_{1..m}) \vee g(\mathbf{x}_{1..m}) & \text{if } x_n = 1 \wedge x_{n-1} = 0 \\ \kappa'(\mathbf{x}_{1..m}) \vee f(\mathbf{x}_{1..m}) \vee g(\mathbf{x}_{1..m}) & \text{if } x_n = 1 \wedge x_{n-1} = 1 \end{cases} \quad (39)$$

The non-constant sub-functions κ', f and g are defined on the feature set $\mathcal{F} \setminus \{n\}$. Moreover, κ', f and g satisfy the following conditions:

1. $\kappa_0 \neq \kappa_1, \kappa' \wedge f = 0, \kappa' \wedge g = 0$ and $f \wedge g = 0$.
2. f predicts a specific point $\mathbf{v}_{1..m}$ to 1.
3. κ' and g predict this specific point $\mathbf{v}_{1..m}$ to 0.
4. The set of CXps for κ_0 and κ_1 with respect to the point $\mathbf{v}_{1..n-1} = (v_1, \dots, v_m, 1)$ are identical.

Choose the specific m -dimensional point $\mathbf{v}_{1..m}$ that f predicts to 1, and extend it with $v_{n-1} = v_n = 1$, we have $\kappa_{00}(\mathbf{v}) = \kappa_{10}(\mathbf{v}) = 0$ and $\kappa_{01}(\mathbf{v}) = \kappa_{11}(\mathbf{v}) = 1$, which means $\kappa(\mathbf{v}) = 1$. As κ_0 and κ_1 share the same set of CXps, they have the same set of AXps. By applying similar reasoning as presented in the proof of Proposition 1, we can conclude that feature n is irrelevant. To prove that feature $n - 1$ is relevant, we assume the contrary that $n - 1$ is irrelevant. In this case, we can flip the value v_{n-1} from 1 to 0 and pick the point $\mathbf{v}' = (v_1, \dots, v_m, 0, 1)$ which predicted to 0 by the function κ_{10} . This means $\kappa(\mathbf{v}') = 0$, leading to a contradiction. Thus, feature $n - 1$ is relevant.

Next, we analyse the SHAP scores of these two features. For feature n , consider an arbitrary $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{F} \setminus \{n-1, n\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_n(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{E}, v_e) &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{2} \cdot (\mathbf{E}[\kappa_{10} | \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}}] - \mathbf{E}[\kappa_{00} | \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}}]) + \frac{1}{2} \cdot (\mathbf{E}[\kappa_{11} | \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}}] - \mathbf{E}[\kappa_{01} | \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}}]) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot \mathbf{E}[g | \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}}],\end{aligned}\quad (40)$$

moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_n(\mathcal{S} \cup \{n-1\}; \mathcal{E}, v_e) &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot (\mathbf{E}[\kappa_{11} | \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}}] - \mathbf{E}[\kappa_{01} | \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}}]) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot \mathbf{E}[g | \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}}].\end{aligned}\quad (41)$$

For feature $n-1$, consider an arbitrary $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{F} \setminus \{n-1, n\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_{n-1}(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{E}, v_e) &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{2} \cdot (\mathbf{E}[\kappa_{01} | \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}}] - \mathbf{E}[\kappa_{00} | \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}}]) + \frac{1}{2} \cdot (\mathbf{E}[\kappa_{11} | \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}}] - \mathbf{E}[\kappa_{10} | \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}}]) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot \mathbf{E}[f | \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}}],\end{aligned}\quad (42)$$

and we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_{n-1}(\mathcal{S} \cup \{n\}; \mathcal{E}, v_e) &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot (\mathbf{E}[\kappa_{11} | \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}}] - \mathbf{E}[\kappa_{10} | \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}}]) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot \mathbf{E}[f | \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}}].\end{aligned}\quad (43)$$

Clearly, by adjusting the sub-functions f and g , we are able to change the magnitude of the SHAP scores of both features. Importantly, in all cases, their SHAP scores have the same sign. \square

Proposition 6. For boolean classifiers, if $\mathcal{E} = (\mathcal{M}, (\mathbf{v}, c))$ exhibits an identified issue (I1 to I6), so does $\mathcal{E}' = (\mathcal{M}', (\mathbf{v}, \neg c))$, where \mathcal{M}' is the negated classifier of \mathcal{M} .

Proof. Let κ' be the classification function of \mathcal{M}' , i.e. $\kappa = \neg \kappa'$. Note that $v_e(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{E}) = \mathbf{E}[\kappa | \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}}]$ and $v_e(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{E}') = \mathbf{E}[\kappa' | \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}}]$. Evidently, $\mathbf{E}[\kappa | \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}}] = 1 - \mathbf{E}[\kappa' | \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}}]$ for any \mathcal{S} , which means $\Delta_i(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{E}, v_e) = -\Delta_i(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{E}', v_e)$. Let $\text{Sc}_{\mathcal{E}}(i; \mathcal{E}', v_e)$ be the SHAP score of feature i in \mathcal{E}' , then we have $\text{Sc}_{\mathcal{E}}(i; \mathcal{E}, v_e) = -\text{Sc}_{\mathcal{E}'}(i; \mathcal{E}', v_e)$, which means that $|\text{Sc}_{\mathcal{E}}(i; \mathcal{E}, v_e)| = |\text{Sc}_{\mathcal{E}'}(i; \mathcal{E}', v_e)|$. Hence, any issue (I1 to I6) that occurs in \mathcal{E} will also occur in \mathcal{E}' . \square

Calculations and Proofs for Regression Problems

Expected values of ρ_2 :

1. $\mathcal{S} = \emptyset$:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{E}[\rho_2(\mathbf{x}) | \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}}] &= \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \int_{-1/2}^{3/2} \int_{-1/2}^{3/2} \rho_2(x_1, x_2) dx_1 dx_2 \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \left[\int_{-1/2}^{3/2} \int_{1/2}^{3/2} x_1 dx_1 dx_2 + \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} (x_2 - 2) dx_1 dx_2 + \int_{1/2}^{3/2} \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} (x_2 + 1) dx_1 dx_2 \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \left[2 \int_{1/2}^{3/2} x_1 dx_1 + \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} (x_2 - 2) dx_2 + \int_{1/2}^{3/2} (x_2 + 1) dx_2 \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \left[2 \left[\frac{x_1^2}{2} \right]_{1/2}^{3/2} + \left[\frac{x_2^2}{2} - 2x_2 \right]_{-1/2}^{1/2} + \left[\frac{x_2^2}{2} + x_2 \right]_{1/2}^{3/2} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{4} [2(9/8 - 1/8) + (1/8 - 1/8 - 2^{1/2} - 2^{1/2}) + (9/8 - 1/8 + 12/8 - 4/8)] \\ &= 1/2\end{aligned}$$

2. $\mathcal{S} = \{1\}$:

$$\mathbf{E}[\rho_2(\mathbf{x}) | \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}}] = \frac{1}{2} \int_{-1/2}^{3/2} \rho_2(1, x_2) dx_2 = \frac{1}{2} \left[\int_{-1/2}^{3/2} 1 dx_2 \right] = 1$$

3. $\mathcal{S} = \{2\}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E}[\rho_2(\mathbf{x}) \mid \mathbf{x}_S = \mathbf{v}_S] &= \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \int_{-1/2}^{3/2} \rho_2(x_1, x_2) dx_1 \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \left[\int_{1/2}^{3/2} x_1 dx_1 + \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} 2 dx_1 \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \left[\left[\frac{x_1^2}{2} \right]_{1/2}^{3/2} + 2 \left[x_1 \right]_{-1/2}^{1/2} \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{9}{8} - \frac{1}{8} + 2 \right] \\
&= \frac{3}{2}
\end{aligned}$$

4. $S = \{1, 2\}$:

$$\mathbf{E}[\rho_2(\mathbf{x}) \mid \mathbf{x}_S = \mathbf{v}_S] = \rho_2(1, 1) = 1$$

Proof regarding ρ_3 :

Proposition 10. ρ_3 (see Figure 2) is Lipschitz-continuous.

Proof. (Sketch) ρ_3 is composed of continuously glued 1-degree 1 polynomials. It is well known that 1-degree 1 polynomials are Lipschitz-continuous (the exact constant depends on the distance used on \mathbb{R}^2) and that gluing several Lipschitz-continuous functions is still a Lipschitz-continuous function (and the constant is the maximum of the constants of the glued functions). (Obs: computing the actual constants does not provide relevant insights, and is considerably laborious. \square)