

# SHARQ: Explainability Framework for Association Rules on Relational Data

Hadar Ben-Efraim  
Bar-Ilan University  
hadarib@mail.biu.ac.il

Susan B. Davidson  
University of Pennsylvania  
susan@cis.upenn.edu

Amit Somech  
Bar-Ilan University  
somecha@cs.biu.ac.il

## ABSTRACT

Association rules are an important technique for gaining insights over large relational datasets consisting of tuples of elements (i.e. attribute-value pairs). However, it is difficult to explain the relative importance of data elements with respect to the rules in which they appear. This paper develops a measure of an element’s contribution to a set of association rules based on Shapley values, denoted SHARQ (ShApley Rules Quantification). As is the case with many Shapely-based computations, the cost of a naive calculation of the score is exponential in the number of elements. To that end, we present an efficient framework for computing the exact SHARQ value of a single element whose running time is practically linear in the number of rules. Going one step further, we develop an efficient multi-element SHARQ algorithm which amortizes the cost of the single element SHARQ calculation over a set of elements. Based on the definition of SHARQ for elements we describe two additional use-cases for association rules explainability: rule importance and attribute importance. Extensive experiments over a novel benchmark dataset containing 45 instances of mined rule sets show the effectiveness of our approach.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Rule-based pattern mining over large relational datasets consisting of tuples of elements (i.e. attribute-value pairs) is one of the most popular tools in a data scientist’s toolbox [2, 21], as it does not require training data and produces clear data patterns and insights. It has been proven to be highly useful for analyzing data in many application domains, such as E-commerce [22, 65], biology [16], cyber security [40], and health [4, 14]. In particular, association rules mining was used in several research studies on COVID-19 data, and provided important insights [38, 68].

Since rule mining tools often return thousands of association rules, which can be overwhelming for users, various techniques have been developed to help manage rules sets. Solutions for this include ranking rules by different interestingness functions [7, 11, 24, 74] and visualization techniques [27, 71] to help users examine and browse the resulting rule set. However, none of these techniques help users understand the relative importance of the *elements* with respect to the rules in which they appear. Understanding the relative importance of elements not only enhances an understanding of the rules, but can also help reduce the number of rules as demonstrated in the following example.

*Example 1.1.* A data analyst, Clarice, is examining the *Adults* dataset [1] which provides demographic information on individuals (see Table 1 for a small sample of this dataset). Clarice is interested in the associations between the elements in the dataset, and uses

Age	Educ. num	Relationship	Gender	Hrs-per-week	Income
25	7	Own-child	Female	40	$\leq 50K$
28	9	Husband	Male	50	$\geq 50K$
29	9	Unmarried	Male	40	$\leq 50K$
44	10	Husband	Male	40	$\leq 50K$

Table 1: Adult [1] Dataset Sample

an association rule mining algorithm on the dataset. She then focuses on the top-4 rules ranked by the IS score [67], a common interestingness measure for association rules that combines both the frequency with which the rule occurs in the dataset (*support*) as well as strength of the relationship between the left- and right-hand sides (*lift*). The rules, alongside their support, lift, and combined IS scores are depicted in Table 2. These rules include a total of six dataset elements,  $e_1$ - $e_6$  (see the two left-most columns of Table 3).

Clarice intuitively notices that element  $e_1$ , (relationship, unmarried), appears to be less important than the others since if it is omitted from  $r_1$  and  $r_4$  then the same patterns still hold in  $r_2$  and  $r_3$ , with roughly the same IS score. Furthermore, rule  $r_3$  has fewer elements than  $r_2$ , so each of its elements,  $e_5$  and  $e_6$ , would appear to proportionally contribute more than  $e_2$ - $e_4$ . Despite their high IS score, rules  $r_1$  and  $r_4$  therefore appear to be redundant.  $\square$

In a sense, measuring an element’s contribution to a rule set is an *explainability* problem, yet unlike in Machine Learning (ML) where there are a plethora of techniques to explain the results of an ML model [45, 53, 54, 60, 66] (see [42] for a survey), to our knowledge no such framework exists to explain association rules mined from the data. Furthermore, generic measures of an element’s contribution to a set of rules, e.g. based on the score of the most interesting rule that contains the element or using causality-based notions such as influence [51, 73], do not adequately differentiate between elements.

*Example 1.2.* Continuing with the example, Clarice wishes to gauge the importance of each of  $e_1$ - $e_6$  to the examined rule set. She employs two intuitive, generic measures to assess the contribution of an element  $e$  to the rules set:  $ITOP(e)$ , which returns the IS score of the most interesting rule that contains the element  $e$ , and  $Influence(e)$  [51, 73], which measures the effect of eliminating the element  $e$  from the rules set (see Section 2.1 for exact definitions). She is frustrated to find that these measures give *identical* scores to  $e_1$ - $e_6$ , as shown in columns 3 and 4 in Table 3.  $\square$

Following ideas in the context of explaining ML models [44, 46] and database query results [8, 17, 43], in this paper we develop a notion of *element contribution* to a set of rules based on the game theoretic notion of Shapley values [59], denoted *SHAPley Rules Quantification* (SHARQ).

ID	Rule LHS	Rule RHS	Support	Lift	IS score ( $\times 10^2$ )
$r_1$	(age, 44-53), (hours-per-week, 40-50), (relationship, unmarried)	(income, $\geq 50K$ )	0.2	5.25	105
$r_2$	(age, 44-53), (hours-per-week, 40-50)	(income, $\geq 50K$ )	0.25	4.08	102
$r_3$	(income, $< 50K$ )	(age, 31-44)	0.43	2.44	105
$r_4$	(income, $< 50K$ )	(age, 31-44), (relationship, unmarried)	0.21	3.33	70

Table 2: Example rules from the Adult Dataset with corresponding interestingness scores

ID	Dataset Element	$I_{TOP}$	Influence	SHARQ
$e_1$	(relationship, unmarried)	1.05	0	-0.6
$e_2$	(hours-per-week, 40-50)	1.05	0	-0.05
$e_3$	(age, 44-53)	1.05	0	-0.05
$e_4$	(income, $\geq 50$ )	1.05	0	-0.05
$e_5$	(age, 31-44)	1.05	0	4.6
$e_6$	(income, $< 50$ )	1.05	0	4.6

Table 3: Element contribution scores for elements  $e_1-e_6$  to the rules set in Table 2

Given a set of rules mined from a dataset and a rule *interestingness* score function [25, 67], SHARQ captures the frequency of the element in the dataset as well as the variability in interestingness across rules of different lengths when the element is excluded. In doing so, it provides a finer measure of contribution than the generic measures illustrated earlier. For the example above, SHARQ clearly differentiates between the different elements with respect to their contribution to the overall interestingness of the rules set compared to  $I_{TOP}$  and *Influence*. This is depicted in the rightmost column in Table 3, where  $e_1$  has a significantly lower score than the other elements, and  $e_5$  and  $e_6$  are higher than  $e_2 - e_4$ , as anticipated in Example 1.1.

Unfortunately, as is the case with Shapley values in general, calculating the SHARQ score of an element can be extremely expensive. We show that, if done naively, the cost is exponential with respect to the size of the dataset (number of elements). However, by reasoning over a set of input rules we are able to develop an exact, optimized  $SHARQ^*$  algorithm that is practically linear with respect to the size of the rule set. This makes exact SHARQ score calculations feasible. Going one step more, we show that we can further reduce the cost of calculating individual  $SHARQ^*$  scores for a set of elements using a multi-element  $SHARQ^*$  algorithm, which amortizes the costs over the set in comparison to calculating the  $SHARQ^*$  score of each element separately.

Since SHARQ scores can be effectively computed for all elements, we explore several explainability use-cases that demonstrate the benefits of our approach. The following example shows a basic use-case of *element importance*, where we analyze the impact of high and low-scoring elements.

*Example 1.3.* Figure 1 shows the SHARQ scores for elements contained in an large (85K) rule set mined from the Adult dataset (positive scores are in green, negative scores are in grey). The figure also includes some statistics for each element – its frequency within the data, and the number of rules it appears in, divided into three interestingness categories (IS): High, Medium, and Low.

We observe that the top five high-scoring elements are frequent and appear mainly in High IS rules. In contrast, the bottom five elements are less frequent and mostly appear in Low IS rules (see Section 4.1 for details).

We then show two additional explainability use-cases that are based on element SHARQ scores: rule importance and attribute importance. As shown in Example 1.1, despite their high IS score rules  $r_1$  and  $r_4$  are redundant of rules  $r_2$  and  $r_3$ , respectively. This could be seen easily since only the top-4 rules were being examined. However, in general, the number of rules above a given interestingness threshold is large, and visually detecting redundant rules becomes infeasible. We show how a notion of rule-level SHARQ scores can be used to narrow the user’s focus on a smaller set of important, non-redundant rules. Similarly, the SHARQ scores of elements can be used to develop a measure of importance of attributes (features), providing users with a higher-level understanding of which attributes most significantly influence the rule generation process.

An extensive set of experiments show the effectiveness of our approach. In particular, we show that while a naive calculation of SHARQ is exponential in the size of the dataset and therefore infeasible, the optimized  $SHARQ^*$  algorithm grows only linearly in the size of the rules and number of attributes. Concretely, computing the SHARQ score for an element using  $SHARQ^*$  takes 6.8 seconds on average, compared to hours and even more by the naive SHARQ calculation. We also show that the multi-element  $SHARQ^*$  algorithm provides an improvement in running time that is proportional to the maximum rule length (12X, in our experiments) over a sequential application of  $SHARQ^*$  over a set of elements. Finally, we show that while generic contribution measures are slightly faster than  $SHARQ^*$ , they provide substantially different ranks for the elements, thus cannot be used for approximating SHARQ. In contrast, we show that a direct approximation of  $SHARQ^*$  based on [46] is significantly better at preserving the element ranking while maintaining similar running times to  $I_{TOP}$  and *Influence*.




Figure 1: Example SHARQ scores alongside rules statistics, using rules mined from the Adult [1] dataset.

Contributions. The contributions of this paper include:

- A novel measure of an element’s contribution to a set of rules based on Shapley values [59] called SHARQ, and theoretical analysis of a naive algorithm based on its definition showing exponential behavior in the size of the dataset.
- An efficient algorithm,  $SHARQ^*$ , for calculating the SHARQ score of a single element, and theoretical analysis showing practically linear behavior in the size of the rule set.
- An efficient multi-element  $SHARQ^*$  for calculating the SHARQ scores for a set of elements, together with an analysis of its complexity. As shown by our use-cases, calculating the SHARQ score for a set of elements arises frequently in practice. Processing SHARQ scores jointly, for a set of elements, rather than linearly for each element of the set amortizes the preprocessing cost over all elements and leads to a reduction in running time that is proportional to the maximum rule length
- Use-cases for SHARQ. Building on the notion of element importance, we give a notion of *rule importance* and *attribute importance*. We also show how our notion of element importance (SHARQ) correlates with the frequency of the element in the dataset, as well as the interestingness of rules in which the element appears.
- A novel evaluation benchmark containing 45 diverse rule sets mined from four different dataset. Each rules set instance contains a different number of rules, different rule lengths and different number of elements.
- Extensive experiments show the effectiveness of our approach: the feasibility of our  $SHARQ^*$  algorithm, the effectiveness of our multi-element  $SHARQ^*$  algorithm, and the superiority of using a direct approximation of  $SHARQ^*$  rather than generic contribution measures such as  $I_{TOP}$  and *Influence*.

*Outline.* We present the SHARQ model and problem definition in Section 2. Our single- and multi-element  $SHARQ^*$  algorithms are given in Section 3, and use-cases are detailed in Section 4. Extensive

Variable	Meaning
$D$	dataset with attributes $\mathcal{A}$ and tuples $T$
$e = (v, a)$	dataset element with attribute $a$ and value $v$
$attr(\cdot), val(\cdot)$	attribute(s), value(s) in tuple/dataset subset
$R_D$	set of mined rules of $D$
$\mathcal{E}(\cdot)$	set of elements in tuple/dataset/ruleset
$E \subseteq \mathcal{E}(D), R \subseteq R_D$	chosen subset of elements, rules
$E_a$	subset of elements in $E$ with attribute $a$
$r = E_{LHS} \rightarrow E_{RHS}$	rule
$\tau$	maximum rule size, $ E_{LHS}  +  E_{RHS} $
$R_S$	subset of rules containing exactly the elements in $S$
$score(r)$	score quantifying interestingness of a rule
$I(R)$	interestingness of a set of rules $R \subseteq R_D$
$C(e, E)$	set of valid coalitions of $E \subseteq \mathcal{E}(D)$ for element $e$
$C^*(e, E)$	optimized set of valid coalitions of $E$ for element $e$
$C_r$	coalitions using elements of rule $r$
$SHARQ_{(E,R)}(e)$	SHARQ score of $e$ in context $E \subseteq \mathcal{E}(D), R \subseteq R_D$
$SHARQ^*_{(E,R)}(e)$	improved formula for $SHARQ_{(E,R)}(e)$

Table 4: Notation

experimental results are presented in Section 5. After surveying related work in Section 6, we close in Section 7.

## 2 SHARQ MODEL & PROBLEM DEFINITION

In this section, we start by defining our model and the notions of rule and rule-set interestingness. We then give a measure of an element’s contribution to a rule-set which we call SHARQ (Section 2.2) and describe its naive implementation. A summary of the notation used throughout the next two sections is given in Table 4.

### 2.1 Model and definitions

*Model.* Given a dataset  $D$  with a set of attributes  $\mathcal{A}$  and tuples  $T$ , a *dataset element* is an attribute-value pair  $e = (a, v)$ , where  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  and value  $v = \Pi_a T$ , i.e., the tuple  $T$  projected on attribute  $a$ . Given  $e = (v, a)$ , we will use  $attr(e)$  to denote its attribute  $a$  and  $val(e)$  to

denote its value  $v$ . Correspondingly,  $attr(E)$  and  $val(E)$  represent the attributes and values (resp.) of a *set* of elements  $E$ . We denote the set of all elements in the dataset  $D$  by  $\mathcal{E}(D)$ . We will also use  $\mathcal{E}(\cdot)$  to denote the elements of a single tuple or of a subset of the data.

We assume that an association rules mining tool [3, 28] has been applied to  $D$ , generating the set of rules  $R_D$ . A rule  $r$  is denoted by  $E_{LHS} \rightarrow E_{RHS}$ , where  $E_{LHS}, E_{RHS} \subseteq \mathcal{E}(D)$ . Extending  $\mathcal{E}(\cdot)$ , we use  $\mathcal{E}(r) = E_{LHS} \cup E_{RHS}$  to denote the set of all elements in the rule  $r$ .

An example of rules for the Adult dataset, as described in our running example, is shown in Table 2. For example,  $r_3$  is the rule  $(Income, <50K) \rightarrow (age, 31-41)$  and  $\mathcal{E}(r_3) = \{(Income, <50K), (Age, 31-41)\}$ .

*Interestingness of a rule and rules set.* A rule score function  $score(r)$  quantifies the interestingness of a rule  $r \in R(D)$ . In our implementation we focus on the IS score [67], which combines two well-known measures: *support* [2], which quantifies the frequency of the joint appearance of the rule’s elements, and *lift* [10], which measures the independence deviation of  $E_{LHS}$  and  $E_{RHS}$ :

$$support(r) = \frac{|\{t | t \in T \wedge \mathcal{E}(r) \subseteq \mathcal{E}(t)\}|}{|T|}$$

$$lift(r) = \frac{support(E_{LHS} \cup E_{RHS})}{support(E_{LHS}) \cdot support(E_{RHS})}$$

The full IS score is then defined by:

$$IS(r) := \sqrt{support(r) \cdot lift(r)}$$

However, our framework can take as input any other measure for rule interestingness as suggested, e.g., in [13, 24, 25, 29, 41].

We will also use a notion for the interestingness of a *set* of rules  $R$ , defined by

$$I(R) := \bigoplus_{r \in R} score(r)$$

where  $\bigoplus$  is an aggregation operation over the individual scores of the rules  $r \in R$ . In our implementation we use  $I(R) := \max_{r \in R} score(r)$ , but our framework also supports other functions such as summation, average, top-k, etc. See Section 5.5 for an empirical comparison.

*Measuring element contribution to a rules set.* Given a set of dataset elements  $E \subseteq \mathcal{E}(D)$  and a set of rules  $R \subseteq R(D)$ , our goal is to assess the *contribution* of an element  $e \in E$  to  $I(R)$  the interestingness of  $R$ . There are several possible ways to quantify an element’s contribution: For example, one could intuitively define the contribution of element  $e$  by the score of the most interesting rule that contains it, which we denote as  $I_{TOP}$ :

$$I_{TOP}(e) := \max_{r \in \{r | r \in R \wedge e \in r\}} score(r)$$

Another way is to use causality-based notions such as influence [51, 73]. In our context, influence can be defined as the difference in the aggregative interestingness of  $R$  when removing the rules that contain  $e$ . Formally:

$$Influence(e) := I(R) - I(R \setminus \{r | r \in R \wedge e \in r\})$$

However, as demonstrated in Example 1.2, these relatively simple measures do not fully capture the contribution of elements. We therefore devise a measure of element contribution based on

the game theoretic notion of Shapley values [59]. Our measure, SHARQ Rules Quantification (SHARQ), formally defined in the next subsection, captures the variability in interestingness across rules of different lengths when the element is excluded. Note that, for Example 1.2, SHARQ clearly differentiates between the different elements w.r.t. their contribution to the overall interestingness as depicted in the rightmost column in Table 3, whereas  $I_{TOP}$  and *Influence* do not.

## 2.2 The SHARQ Formula

We assume a dataset  $D$  and set of rules  $R_D$ . Given a set of elements  $E \subseteq \mathcal{E}(D)$  and a set of rules  $R \subseteq R_D$ , our goal is to measure the *contribution* of an element  $e \in E$  to the interestingness of  $R$ . For this, we use the game-theoretic notion of the Shapely value [59], which is widely used in XAI [45, 64] as well as for data management and exploration tasks [18–20] (see Section 6 for a discussion).

The Shapley value measures a *player’s contribution* to the *utility* of all possible *player coalitions*. In our adaptation of Shapley values, which we call SHARQ Rules Quantification (SHARQ), the “players” are elements in  $E$  and “coalitions” are sets of elements with disjoint attributes. That is, coalitions model rules and the contribution of an element is (roughly speaking) the difference in interestingness of rules in which they play a role and those in which they don’t play a role.

More precisely, given a set of elements  $S \subseteq E$ , we use  $R_S$  to denote the subset of rules of  $R$  that contain *exactly* the elements in  $S$ :

$$R_S := \{r | r \in R \wedge \mathcal{E}(r) = S\}$$

Note that a rule never contains two elements with the same attribute, and therefore  $S$  cannot contain two elements with the same attribute. The *utility* of an element coalition  $S$  is then defined as  $I(R_S)$ , i.e., the *aggregative* interestingness of  $R_S$  as defined previously. Naturally, if  $R_S = \emptyset$  then  $I(R_S) = 0$ .

Due to this notion of utility, we consider only *valid* coalitions with respect to an element, i.e. those that can possibly form a rule when the element is included. Given an element  $e$ , and a set of elements  $E \in \mathcal{E}(D)$ , we define the set of *valid* coalitions as follows:

$$C(e, E) := \{S | S \subseteq E \wedge |attr(S)| = |S| \wedge attr(e) \notin attr(S)\}$$

Namely, all subsets of  $E$  that, together with element  $e$ , do not contain two elements of the same attribute.

The SHARQ score of an element  $e$  in the context of  $E$  and  $R$  can now be defined as follows:

$$SHARQ_{(E,R)}(e) = \sum_{S \in C(e,E)} \frac{|S|!(|E| - |S| - 1)!}{|E|} \cdot (I(R_{S \cup \{e\}}) - I(R_S))$$

*Example 2.1.* Returning to Clarice’s analysis of the *Adults* dataset, the SHARQ scores were calculated as follows: For element  $e_1$  the valid coalitions are any subset of  $\{e_2, e_3, e_4, e_5, e_6\}$  that do not contain both  $e_4$  and  $e_6$  since they both have the same attribute. For  $S = \{e_2, e_3, e_4\}$  we have  $R_S = \{r_2\}$  and  $R_{S \cup \{e_1\}} = \{r_1\}$ . As shown in Table 2,  $I(R_S) = 102$  and  $I(R_{S \cup \{e_1\}}) = 105$ . Therefore, for  $S = \{e_2, e_3, e_4\}$  we get a score of  $\frac{3!(6-3-1)!}{6!} \cdot (1.05 - 1.02) = 0.05$ . We sum the weighted value function difference for the rest of the valid coalitions, and calculate  $SHARQ(e_1) = -0.6$ . This means that  $e_1$  has low contribution (relatively to the other elements) to the rules set

formed by  $e_1 - e_6$  since, when omitted from every valid coalition, there is always another rule with a similar IS score.

In contrast,  $e_5, e_6$  obtain the highest SHARQ score of 4.6. For each of these elements, if we add them to a coalition that forms one of the rules  $r_2, r_4$  the interestingness score difference will be negative. For example-  $I(R_{\{e_2, e_3, e_4\} \cup \{e_5\}}) - I(R_{\{e_1, e_2, e_3\}}) = -102$ . For element  $e_6$  and coalition  $\{e_5\}$  the calculation is  $\frac{1!(6-1-1)!}{6!} \cdot (105 - 0) = 3.5$ .  $\square$

To find the valid coalitions for an element  $e$ , The set  $E$  is divided into subsets of elements with the same attribute; elements with attribute  $attr(e)$  are omitted. Coalitions are then formed by choosing either a single element or nothing from each attribute set.

*Number of Coalitions.* The cost of any application of Shapley values is determined by the number of *coalitions*, which is exponential in the number of *players*. For example, when computing Shapley values in the context of supervised ML explanations [35, 46], the players are the data *attributes*. When computing Shapley values for database query results [43] the players are the dataset *tuples*. In our context, the players are the dataset elements, which is often considerably larger than the number of attributes, and in many datasets can also surpass the number of tuples.

The number of valid coalitions for a dataset element  $e$  can be calculated as follows: Let  $E_a$  be the subset of elements in  $E$  with attribute  $a$ , i.e.,  $attr(e) = a$ . Each attribute  $a$  has  $|E_a| + 1$  options for representation in a coalition - either the attribute does not appear or has one of the values in  $E_a$ . Therefore, the number of valid coalitions for  $e$  is  $\prod_{a \in \{attr(E)\} - \{attr(e)\}} (|E_a| + 1)$ . In the worst case, there are  $|T|$  unique elements in each column and  $attr(E) = \mathcal{A}$ , hence the cost of calculating the SHARQ score for a single element  $e$  is  $O(|T|^{|A|})$ .

As we show in Section 5.2, calculating  $SHARQ_{(E,R)}(e)$  becomes infeasible even for small rule sets. We therefore develop an improved formula in which a substantial number of irrelevant element coalitions that do not affect the SHARQ score are pruned, and use this to develop efficient algorithms for calculating SHARQ scores.

### 3 EFFICIENT SHARQ ALGORITHMS

Since calculating the SHARQ score of an element directly is often infeasible, in this section we devise a computational framework, denoted  $SHARQ^*$ , for facilitating the SHARQ computation while retaining the exact same output as SHARQ. First, in Section 3.1, we give an improved formula  $SHARQ_{(E,R)}^*(e)$  in which element coalitions that do not affect the score are pruned. We further prove that the improved formula is equivalent to SHARQ, i.e., that  $SHARQ_{(E,R)}^*(e) = SHARQ_{(E,R)}(e)$ . However, in contrast to the original formula in which the number of coalitions is *exponential* in the number of dataset attributes, the number of coalitions in the improved formula is several orders of magnitude smaller, bounded by the product of the number of rules and maximum rule size. This is essentially *linear* in the number of rules since the maximum rule size is typically small (e.g. less than 10)<sup>1</sup> In Section 3.2 we then show an exact algorithm to calculate  $SHARQ^*$  for a single element  $e \in E$ .

<sup>1</sup>This reduction is due to thresholds set on support and interestingness in rule mining algorithms [2, 28].

Lastly, since many rule set explanation use cases require the calculation of SHARQ scores for *multiple* elements (see Section 4), in Section 3.3 we describe a multi-element  $SHARQ^*$  algorithm. Given a *set* of elements  $E$ , the algorithm amortizes the cost of materializing the valid element coalitions for  $SHARQ^*$  by calculating it *once*, jointly for all elements in  $E$ . We show that the multi-element  $SHARQ^*$  algorithm is superior to a sequential application of  $SHARQ^*$  over each element of  $E$ , reduces running time costs by an average of about 12X.

#### 3.1 Improved Formula: $SHARQ^*$

Our improved formula,  $SHARQ^*$ , is based on the observation that an element coalition  $S$  has no contribution to the  $SHARQ_{(E,R)}(e)$  calculation if  $R_S = \emptyset$  and  $R_S \cup \{e\} = \emptyset$ . In this case,  $I(R_{S \cup \{e\}}) = I(R_S) = 0$ . Consequently, we can safely restrict the SHARQ calculation to coalitions formed from the elements in rules or those with one rule element removed:

$$C^* := \{S \mid \exists r \in R : (S \subseteq \mathcal{E}(r) \wedge |S| \geq |\mathcal{E}(r)| - 1)\} \quad (1)$$

Given  $e$  and  $E$ , the *optimized valid* coalitions are thus:

$$C^*(e, E) := \{S \mid S \in C^* \wedge S \subseteq E \wedge attr(e) \notin attr(S)\} \quad (2)$$

The improved formula  $SHARQ^*$  then becomes:

$$SHARQ_{(E,R)}^*(e) = \sum_{S \in C^*(e,E)} \frac{|S|!(|E| - |S| - 1)!}{|E|} \cdot (I(R_{S \cup \{e\}}) - I(R_S)) \quad (3)$$

We now show that SHARQ and  $SHARQ^*$  are equivalent.

PROPOSITION 3.1.  $\forall e \in E, SHARQ_{(E,R)}^*(e) = SHARQ_{(E,R)}(e)$

PROOF. Given an element  $e$ , we can divide  $C(e, E)$  into two sets of coalitions: those that are contained in the elements of some rule, denoted  $C_1(e, E)$ ; and those that are not contained in the elements of any rule, denoted  $C_2(e, E)$ . We formally define these subsets as:

$$C_1(e, E) = \{S \mid S \subseteq E \wedge |attr(S)| = |S| \wedge attr(e) \notin attr(S) \wedge (\exists r \in R : S \subseteq \mathcal{E}(r))\}$$

$$C_2(e, E) = \{S \mid S \subseteq E \wedge |attr(S)| = |S| \wedge attr(e) \notin attr(S) \wedge (\forall r \in R : S \not\subseteq \mathcal{E}(r))\}$$

We can then rewrite the  $SHARQ_{(E,R)}(e)$  expression:

$$\sum_{S \in C_1(e,E)} \frac{|S|!(|E| - |S| - 1)!}{|E|} \cdot (I(R_{S \cup \{e\}}) - I(R_S)) \quad (4)$$

+

$$\sum_{S \in C_2(e,E)} \frac{|S|!(|E| - |S| - 1)!}{|E|} \cdot (I(R_{S \cup \{e\}}) - I(R_S)) \quad (5)$$

Observe that for every  $S \in C_2(e, E)$ ,  $R_S = R_{(S \cup \{e\})} = \emptyset$  and therefore  $I(R_{(S \cup \{e\})}) = I(R_S) = 0$ . Hence we can simplify  $SHARQ_{(E,R)}(e)$  to Equation 4, which considers only the coalitions in  $C_1(e)$ .

Since attributes are never repeated in rules,  $C_1(e, E)$  can be simplified to:

$$C_1(e, E) = \{S \mid (\exists r \in R : S \subseteq (\mathcal{E}(r) \cap E)) \wedge attr(e) \notin attr(S)\}$$

Folding in the definition of  $C^*$ ,  $C^*(e, E)$  can be written as:

$$C^*(e, E) := \{S \mid (\exists r \in R : (S \subseteq (\mathcal{E}(r) \cap E)) \wedge \text{attr}(e) \notin \text{attr}(S)) \wedge |S| \geq |\mathcal{E}(r) - 1\}$$

Therefore  $C^*(e, E) \subseteq C_1(e, E)$ .

Now suppose that  $SHARQ_{(E,R)}^*(e) \neq SHARQ_{(E,R)}(e)$  for some element  $e$ . Then there is a coalition  $S$  in  $C_1(e, E)$  that is not in  $C^*(e, E)$  for which  $I(R_{S \cup \{e\}}) - I(R_S) \neq 0$ .

For this to be true, either  $S$  has to form some rule in  $R$  but not in  $S \cup \{e\}$ , or  $S \cup \{e\}$  has to form a rule in  $R$  but not in  $S$ , or both  $S$  and  $S \cup \{e\}$  form rules in  $R$ . In all cases,  $S$  must be in  $C^*(e, E)$  by definition. Therefore  $\forall e, SHARQ_{(E,R)}^*(e) = SHARQ_{(E,R)}(e)$ .  $\square$

*Number of Coalitions.* Since coalitions in  $C^*(e, E)$  are formed using rules in  $R$ , each rule  $r$  creates either  $|\mathcal{E}(r)| + 1$  coalitions (when  $r$  does not contain an element  $e'$  with  $\text{attr}(e) = \text{attr}(e')$ , each subset  $E \subseteq \mathcal{E}(r)$  of size  $\geq |\mathcal{E}(r)|$  is considered), or the single coalition (when  $r$  contains an element  $e'$  with  $\text{attr}(e) = \text{attr}(e')$  the only considered coalition is  $\mathcal{E}(r) - \{e'\}$ ). Assuming that  $\gamma$  percent of the rules do not contain an element with  $\text{attr}(e)$  and that the maximum rule size is  $\tau$ , the size of  $C^*(e, E)$  is at worst  $(\gamma \cdot |R| \cdot (\tau + 1) + ((1 - \gamma) \cdot |R|))$ , which is  $O(|R| \cdot \gamma \cdot \tau)$ .

In the worst case, in which  $\gamma = 1$  and  $\tau = |\mathcal{A}|$ , the size of  $C^*(e, E)$  is  $O(|R| \cdot |\mathcal{A}|)$ . This is a significant improvement over the number of coalitions in the non-optimized SHARQ score,  $O(|T|^{|\mathcal{A}|})$ , which is *exponential* w.r.t. the number of rows in the dataset.

Note, however, that  $|R|$  may be larger than  $|T|$  for some datasets and rule mining settings (in the worst case, exponential in  $|T|$ ). In our experimental evaluation, we examined 66 rule sets mined from four different datasets. We found that  $|R|$  was indeed larger than  $|T|$  in 11 cases, but with only a maximum ratio of  $|R| \approx 64 \cdot |T|$ . Even in this extreme case, the number of coalitions used by the optimized  $SHARQ^*$  was 9.5K, compared to 16.7M used by the naive SHARQ computation.

This optimization allows us to compute SHARQ scores in a reasonable amount of time – 6.6 seconds on average, per element, compared to several hours (or more) by the naive SHARQ computation. We next present our full  $SHARQ^*$  algorithm, which improves the calculation by considering two additional aspects: (1) the retrieval of the optimized valid coalition set  $C^*(e, E)$ , and (2) the calculation of the utility function difference  $I(R_{S \cup \{e\}}) - I(R_S)$ .

### 3.2 The $SHARQ^*$ Algorithm (Single Element)

The single element  $SHARQ^*$  algorithm, shown in Algorithm 1, takes as input a rule set  $R \in R(D)$ , a set of elements  $E \in \mathcal{E}(D)$ , and a single element  $e \in E$ . The algorithm has two parts: (1) generating the optimized set of coalitions for  $e$ ,  $C^*(e, E)$ , and creating a coalition rules index to reduce the cost of calculating the score (lines 3-13), and (2) incrementally calculating the  $SHARQ^*$  score (lines 14-18 of the CalcSHARQ function).

In the first part, a single pass is done over the rule set  $R$ . For each rule  $r$ , the coalitions using elements of that rule,  $C_r$ , are generated (line 6). To reduce the cost of calculating  $I(R_{S \cup \{e\}}) - I(R_S)$ , we incrementally create a *coalition rules index*,  $\mathcal{R}$ , by adding  $r$  to  $\mathcal{R}_S$

for each coalition  $S$  in  $C_r$ , as well as  $\mathcal{R}_{S \cup \{e\}}$  if there is not already an element of type  $\text{attr}(e)$  in  $S$  (lines 4-13).

In the second part, we compute  $SHARQ_{(E,R)}^*(e)$  using the CalcSHARQ function. This is done by incrementally adding the contribution of  $e$  to each coalition  $S \in C^*(e, E)$ : We fetch  $\mathcal{R}_S$  and  $\mathcal{R}_{S \cup \{e\}}$  from the coalition rules index  $\mathcal{R}$  (line 16), then calculate the interestingness difference  $I(R_{S \cup \{e\}}) - I(R_S)$  and multiply by the Shapley factorial coefficient  $\frac{|S|!(|E| - |S| - 1)!}{|E|}$  (Line 17). The sum of these individual contribution scores form the final  $SHARQ_{(E,R)}^*(e)$  score, as indicated in Equation 3.

*Cost Analysis.* In the first part of the algorithm, we iterate through each  $r \in R$  and form coalitions. Forming a coalition takes time proportional to the size of  $r$ , which we assume is  $\tau$ . Since there are at most  $\tau + 1$  coalitions per rule, forming the coalitions for a single rule (line 4) is  $O(\tau^2)$ , yielding an overall cost of  $O(|R| \cdot \tau^2)$  for the first part.

In the second part, we iterate over  $C^*(e, E)$  to compute the  $SHARQ_{(E,R)}^*(e)$  score. Assuming that accessing the index  $\mathcal{R}$  and calculating the utility scores  $I(\cdot)$  are both  $O(1)$ , the cost of this part is the size of  $C^*(e, E)$ . The overall cost of the two parts is thus  $O(|R| \cdot \tau \cdot (\tau + \gamma))$ . Since  $\gamma \leq 1$ , this is essentially  $O(|R| \cdot \tau^2)$ . Since rules are typically small ( $\tau \ll |\mathcal{A}|$ ), we call this “practically linear” in the number of rules. However, in the worst case, where  $\tau = |\mathcal{A}|$  this becomes  $O(|R| \cdot |\mathcal{A}|^2)$ .

Next, we extend our discussion of calculating SHARQ scores to a *subset* of elements rather than a single one. We present an effective algorithm for this multi-element case which significantly reduces the cost of generating the coalitions,  $C^*$ , as well as the coalition rules index,  $\mathcal{R}$ .

### 3.3 Multi-Element $SHARQ^*$ Algorithm

Many of the use cases of SHARQ focus on the scores of *all* dataset elements  $\mathcal{E}(D)$  (or a large subset thereof) rather than the score of a single element (see Section 4). For example, users might want to reduce the number of elements by dropping those with near zero SHARQ contribution over a large rule set. This in turn will reduce the number of rules, allowing users to more quickly observe interesting patterns.

Given a set of  $E$  elements, one can naively run the single element  $SHARQ^*$  algorithm, as described in Algorithm 1, and compute  $SHARQ_{(E,R)}^*(e)$  for each  $e \in E$ . However, this is inefficient, since the pre-processing phase, in which we generate the coalition set  $C^*(e, E)$  and the coalitions-to-rules index  $\mathcal{R}$ , is repeated  $|E|$  times. In doing so, the same coalition set may be recalculated several times:

**Observation 3.2.** If two elements  $e, e' \in E$  have the same attribute,  $\text{attr}(e) = \text{attr}(e')$ , then  $C^*(e, E) = C^*(e', E)$

This observation stems from the definition of  $C^*(e, E)$  (see Equation 2), which excludes from  $C^*$  all coalitions that contain an element with the same attribute as  $e$ . We can therefore calculate and save the set of coalitions for each *attribute*  $a \in \text{attr}(E)$  that appears in some element in  $E$  rather than saving it for each *element*  $e \in E$ , thus achieving significant savings in space and time.

---

**Algorithm 1 Single Element SHARQ\***

---

**Input:** Rule set  $R \subseteq R_D$ , element set  $E \subseteq \mathcal{E}(D)$ , single element  $e \in E$   
**Output:**  $SHARQ_{(E,R)}^*(e)$ , the SHARQ score of element  $e$

- 1:  $C_e^* \leftarrow$  Initialize empty optimized coalitions set  $C^*(e, E)$
- 2:  $\mathcal{R} \leftarrow$  Initialize empty coalition-to-rules index
- 3: **for** rule  $r \in \{r | r \in R \wedge \mathcal{E}(r) \subseteq E\}$  **do**
- 4:    $C_r = \{S | S \subseteq \mathcal{E}(r) \wedge |S| \geq |\mathcal{E}(r)| - 1\}$
- 5:   **for** coalition  $S \in C_r$  **do**
- 6:      $\mathcal{R}[S] \leftarrow \mathcal{R}[S] + (r)$
- 7:     **if**  $attr(e) \notin S$  **then**
- 8:        $C_e^* \leftarrow C_e^* \cup \{S\}$
- 9:     **end if**
- 10:   **end for**
- 11: **end for**
- 12: **return** CalcSHARQ( $e, E, \mathcal{R}, C_e^*$ )
  
- 13: **function** CalcSHARQ( $e, E, \mathcal{R}, C_e^*$ )
- 14:    $SHARQ_{(E,R)}^*(e) \leftarrow 0$
- 15:   **for** coalition  $S \in C_e^*$  **do**
- 16:      $R_S, R_{S \cup \{e\}} \leftarrow \mathcal{R}[S], \mathcal{R}[S \cup \{e\}]$
- 17:      $SHARQ_{(E,R)}^*(e) += \frac{|S|!(|E|-|S|-1)!}{|E|} \cdot (I(R_{S \cup \{e\}}) - I(R_S))$
- 18:   **end for**
- 19:   **return**  $SHARQ_{(E,R)}^*(e)$
- 20: **end function**

---

The multi-element SHARQ\* algorithm is shown in Algorithm 2. The algorithm takes a rule set  $R$  and a set of elements  $E$ , and calculates all SHARQ scores, for each  $e \in E$ . We first initialize a coalitions index  $C$ , which stores the set of coalitions for each attribute (based on Observation 3.2) and the coalitions-to-rules index  $\mathcal{R}$  (Lines 1-2). We then scan the rules and update  $\mathcal{R}$  as in Algorithm 1 as we extract coalitions from each rule (Lines 3-6). Next, we update the optimized-coalitions index  $C$  when processing each extracted coalition  $S$ , adding it to the coalitions set of all relevant attributes, i.e., that are in  $attr(E) \setminus attr(S)$  (lines 5-10). Finally, to calculate the SHARQ scores for each element  $e$  we first fetch its coalitions set from the coalitions index  $C$  (Line 13), then call the CalcSHARQ function from Algorithm 1 (line 14).

*Cost Analysis.* In the first part of the algorithm we iterate through each  $r \in R$  and form coalitions in order to incrementally construct the coalitions index and coalitions-to-rules index. As mentioned previously, this takes  $O(\tau^2)$  per rule. In addition to adding  $r$  to the coalition-to-rules index, we add each coalition  $S$  formed from  $r$  to the optimized-coalitions index of each attribute  $a$  that appears in  $E$  but does not appear in  $S$ . Assuming that the cost of calculating  $attr(E) \setminus attr(S)$  is  $|attr(E)|$ , the cost of the first part is  $O(|R| \cdot (\tau^2 + |attr(E)|))$ .

In the second part, after building the index structures, we calculate the SHARQ scores by iterating over each element  $e \in E$ , retrieving the optimized valid coalitions for  $e$ , and computing the final score. Assuming that accessing the indexes  $C, \mathcal{R}$  and calculating the utility scores  $I(\cdot)$  are all  $O(1)$ , the cost of this part is  $O(|E| \cdot |R| \cdot \gamma\tau)$ . Since  $\gamma < 1$ , this could be simplified to  $O(|E| \cdot |R| \cdot \tau)$ . The total

---

**Algorithm 2 Multi-element SHARQ\***

---

**Input:** Rule set  $R \subseteq R_D$ , element set  $E \subseteq \mathcal{E}(D)$   
**Output:** All SHARQ Scores  $SHARQ_{(E,R)}^*(e), \forall e \in E$

- 1:  $C \leftarrow$  initialize empty optimized-coalitions index
- 2:  $\mathcal{R} \leftarrow$  initialize empty coalition-to-rules index
- 3: **for** rule  $r \in \{r | r \in R \wedge \mathcal{E}(r) \subseteq E\}$  **do**
- 4:    $C_r = \{S | S \subseteq \mathcal{E}(r) \wedge |S| \geq |\mathcal{E}(r)| - 1\}$
- 5:   **for** coalition  $S \in C_r$  **do**
- 6:      $\mathcal{R}[S] \leftarrow \mathcal{R}[S] + (r)$
- 7:     **for** attribute  $a \in attr(E) \setminus attr(S)$  **do**
- 8:        $C[a] \leftarrow C[a] \cup \{S\}$
- 9:     **end for**
- 10:   **end for**
- 11: **end for**
- 12: **for** element  $e \in E$  **do**
- 13:    $C_e^* \leftarrow C[attr(e)]$
- 14:   **yield** CalcSHARQ( $e, E, \mathcal{R}, C_e^*$ )
- 15: **end for**

---

cost of the algorithm is therefore  $O(|R| \cdot (\tau^2 + |attr(E)| + |E| \cdot \tau))$ . Recall that the cost of running the single element algorithm for all elements in  $E$  is bounded by  $O(|E| \cdot |R| \cdot \tau(\tau + 1))$ . Since  $|attr(E)| \leq |E|$ , the ratio of the costs of the sequential approach and Algorithm 2 is *at least*  $\frac{|E| \cdot \tau(\tau + 1)}{|E| \cdot (\tau + 1) + \tau^2}$ . Based on this, we can show that, roughly,

Algorithm 2 reduces running times by a factor greater than  $\frac{|E| \cdot \tau}{|E| + \tau + 1}$ .

In our experiments (See Section 5.3), we show that the multi-element SHARQ\* algorithm achieves a minimal improvement of 6.7X and a maximal of 25X, with an average factor of 13.8X.

## 4 RULES EXPLAINABILITY USE CASES

We next illustrate three use cases for association rules explainability using SHARQ. As in our running example, we use the Adult [1] dataset; unlike the example, we use the *full* set of rules mined from the data.

Our first use case is *element importance*, described in Section 4.1. In this use case, we calculate the SHARQ scores for all dataset elements and analyze the impact of both high-scoring and low-scoring elements. Building on this analysis, we introduce two additional use cases: *rule importance* (Section 4.2), where we identify *redundant* rules that, despite their high interestingness scores, are similar to other, *shorter* rules with equivalent scores. Removing these redundant rules helps to narrow the user's focus to a more concise set of significant rules. Finally, the *attribute importance* use case (Section 4.3) leverages the SHARQ scores of elements to determine the significance of attributes relative to the mined rules, thus providing users with a higher-level understanding of which attributes most significantly influence the rule generation process.

### 4.1 SHARQ Element Importance

We apply the Apriori [3] rules mining algorithm on the Adult [1], after discretizing the data by binning numeric columns<sup>2</sup>, setting the minimum support threshold to 0.05. This results in a set of 84479

<sup>2</sup>Discretization of numeric data is required by most rules-mining algorithms, which traditionally work on transactional data with discrete items. [2, 28, 62]

Id	Rule		R-SHARQ Score	IS score
	LHS	RHS		
1	(Gender, Male)	(Capital-Gain ,0 - 10K), (Relationship, Husband)	0.06	0.76
2	(Gender, Male)	(Relationship, Husband)	1.75	0.77
3	(Educational-Num, 8 - 12)	(Income, <=50K)	4	0.73
4	(Educational-Num, 8 - 12), (Native-Country, United-States)	(Income, <=50K)	0.21	0.7

Figure 2: R-SHARQ rule score examples.

rules, spanning 34 unique dataset elements (see our code repository in [52] for full settings and output). Next, we calculate the SHARQ scores for all individual elements in  $E = \mathcal{E}(R)$ , i.e., all elements that participate in at least one rule.

As briefly introduced in Example 1.3, Figure 1 illustrates the SHARQ scores, ordered from high to low. For the analysis of the scores, we provide additional statistics for each dataset element: the frequency of the element, denoted as  $freq(e) = \frac{|\text{Rows containing element } e|}{|\text{Total rows}|} \times 100$ ; and the number of rules in which the element appears, divided into three categories of interestingness (IS): Low IS (0.22 - 0.41), Medium IS (0.41 - 0.59), and High IS (0.59 - 0.78). We also specify the proportion of rules (in parentheses) that fall into each IS category. Out of the total 84,479 rules, 69,776 are classified as *low interestingness*, 13,358 as *medium interestingness*, and 1,345 as *high interestingness*.

Analyzing the SHARQ scores, we observe that the top five high-scoring elements are highly frequent in the data, each with a frequency exceeding 41%. Furthermore, these elements prominently appear in High IS rules (more than 20%) and Medium IS rules (over 35%). In contrast, the bottom five elements are less common, appearing in less than 17% of the rows, and are predominantly found in Low IS rules.

Additionally, we note that some highly-frequent elements in the data obtain nearly zero SHARQ scores. Examples are (*native-country, United States*), (*Capital-Gain, 0-10K*), and (*Capital-Loss, 0-1K*), with respective frequency values of 89%, 97%, and 95% and SHARQ scores of 0.03, 0.007, and  $1.3e-5$ , respectively. This occurs because SHARQ scores take into account the importance of an element to a rule, as discussed in Example 1.1. Despite their high frequency in the data, these elements are considered *non-influential* because removing them leads to shorter, yet equivalently interesting rules.

We next demonstrate how SHARQ can be used to identify rule redundancy, thereby allowing the user to focus on a smaller, more concise set of rules.

## 4.2 Rule Importance: Detecting Redundancy

Our analysis above reveals some highly-frequent elements with nearly zero SHARQ score. We next show how to detect such elements with a *normalized* SHARQ score. Then, using the normalized SHARQ, we define the SHARQ score for *rules* and use it to identify important, non-redundant rules.

*Normalized SHARQ.* To provide a normalized SHARQ score for an element  $e \in E$  which accounts for the element’s frequency, we use the following: First, let  $R_{SHARQ}(e)$  be the *rank* of element  $e$  w.r.t. the score  $SHARQ_{(E,R)}(e)$  (a rank of  $i$  is given to the top- $i$

scoring elements). We also denote by  $R_{freq}(e)$  the *frequency* rank of an element  $e$ , s.t., the most frequent element is ranked 1. Then the normalized score is given by:

$$\overline{SHARQ}_{(E,R)}(e) = \frac{R_{freq}(e)}{R_{SHARQ}(e)}$$

Intuitively, the *lower* the normalized SHARQ score the more *redundant* the element  $e$  is.

Using normalized SHARQ, we define the *rule-level* SHARQ:

$$R\text{-SHARQ}_{(E,R)}(r) = \min_{e \in \mathcal{E}(r)} \overline{SHARQ}_{(E,R)}(e)$$

Namely, the SHARQ rule score is determined by its lowest-scoring element.

Figure 2 depicts several rules alongside their IS interestingness scores and corresponding R-SHARQ score. For each rule, we colored the element obtaining the lowest normalized SHARQ score. The color is proportional to the score – grey symbolizes low scores, and green symbolizes high scores.

For example, Rule #1, (*educational-num,8-12*), (*Native-country, United-States*)  $\rightarrow$  (*income, <= 50K*) obtains a high IS score of 0.7, yet a low R-SHARQ score of 0.21. This difference can be explained by the fact that the rule contains the element (*Native-country, United-States*), which has a low normalized SHARQ score (colored in light grey). An equivalent rule exists *without* this element (Rule #2): (*educational-num,8-12*)  $\rightarrow$  (*income, <= 50K*). Rule#2 has an even higher IS score (0.73), and a substantially higher R-SHARQ score of 4.

In a similar manner, Rule #3, (*Gender,Male*)  $\rightarrow$  (*Capital-Gain, 0-10K*), (*Relationship, Husband*) obtains a low R-SHARQ score of 0.06. When eliminating the element (*Capital-gain,0-10K*) we obtain Rule #4, (*Gender, Male*)  $\rightarrow$  (*Relationship, Husband*), which obtains a higher IS score of 0.77 and a higher R-SHARQ score of 1.75.

Note that when setting a rule-level SHARQ threshold of 0.21 (the R-SHARQ score of Rule#1), a total of 68250 (95%) rules fall below the threshold. Eliminating these rules allow the user to focus on a much smaller set of 3140 important, non-redundant rules.

## 4.3 Rules-driven Attribute Importance

We next show another common explainability use case, attribute (feature) importance, in which we use SHARQ to detect the most significant attributes for the given set of association rules.

To do so, we define an *attribute-level* SHARQ score:

$$A\text{-SHARQ}_{(E,R)}(a) = \frac{\sum_{e \in E_a \cap \mathcal{E}(R)} \overline{SHARQ}_{(E,R)}(e)}{E_a}$$

where  $E_a$  is the subset of  $E$  whose elements have attribute  $a$ . This is the mean *normalized* SHARQ score for the elements of attribute  $a$  that appear in at least one rule.

Figure 3 depicts the importance scores of sample attributes in the Adult dataset, sorted from left (lowest) to right (highest). Below the attribute importance scores, the figure shows the attribute elements. The cell background colors reflect the *element-level* SHARQ scores, from grey (low) to green (high), and the cell size reflects the frequency of the element with respect to the attribute value distribution (namely, longer cells represent more frequent elements).

Notice that the *Income* and *Gender* columns obtain the highest attribute scores, as both contain only high-importance individual






Figure 3: A-SHARQ attribute importance scores

elements. The *Relationship* column is ranked third, as one of its elements, 'Not-in-Family', has a low importance score (colored in grey in the figure).

Also note that the columns *Capital-loss*, *Capital-gain*, *Native-country*, and *Race* obtain the lowest A-SHARQ importance scores. This is because they all contain a single dominant element with a high frequency, yet low importance (see their corresponding element-level SHARQ scores in the lower part of Figure 3).

The attributes importance scores can be used, e.g., to reduce the dimensionality of the data (by disregarding low-scoring attributes) when performing analytical tasks.

*Summary & Discussion.* In this section, we gave two additional explainability applications based on the element-level SHARQ scores: rule-level and attribute-level importance scores. As demonstrated in [44], a similar analysis in the context of ML explainability is performed using the SHAP [46] explainability framework, where individual SHAP scores are aggregated over multiple predictions. Using such aggregations, one can explain global aspects of the ML model, including global feature importance scores and feature dependency analysis. In our context, additional interesting aggregations of the element-level SHARQ scores include feature interaction, which examines the change in importance of one feature (element) as a function of the values of a second feature; calculation of element *subsets* importance; and SHARQ correlations.

## 5 EXPERIMENTAL EVALUATION

We conducted our experiments on a evaluation set consisting of 45 different rule mining results, generated using the Apriori algorithm [3] with different settings and datasets. The evaluation setup is discussed in Section 5.1. We then describe four different sets of experiments.

First, we examine the performance of our optimized *SHARQ\** algorithm and compare it to the naive calculation of the SHARQ formula. In line with our theoretical cost analysis, the results in Section 5.2 show that the naive calculation is infeasible as it iterates over more than 65138729 coalitions on average, whereas *SHARQ\** uses only 8524.

Next, we analyze the performance of our multi-element *SHARQ\** algorithm in order to see whether it indeed provides a significant performance improvement compared to a sequential calculation of *SHARQ\**. As we show in Section 5.3, the multi-element algorithm provides an average of 13.8X improvement in running time.

We then test the ability of alternative approaches such as *influence* and *I<sub>TOP</sub>* (see Section 2.1) to approximate the score of SHARQ. Our findings, provided in Section 5.4, show that a direct approximation for SHARQ based on [46] is significantly better at preserving the original SHARQ elements ranking while maintaining similar running times to *Influence* and *I<sub>TOP</sub>*.

Finally, in Section 5.5 we examine the effect of using different notions of interestingness for rules and rule sets. We find that the SHARQ scores are robust and consistent, and do not significantly change when using such alternative notions.

### 5.1 Experimental Setup & Evaluation Set

We first describe our experimental setup and explain how we constructed our evaluation set, consisting of 67 different rule mining settings applied on four underlying datasets.

**Implementation and Default Configuration.** SHARQ is implemented in Python 3.10. It uses an Apriori algorithm implementation<sup>3</sup> to generate the rules, and Pandas [48] to store and manipulate

<sup>3</sup><https://efficient-apriori.readthedocs.io/en/latest/>

Dataset	Num. of Rule Sets	Num. of Rules	Avg. Rule Len.	Num. of Elements
<i>Adults</i>	14	[563, 471474]	[3.8, 6.8]	[21, 34]
<i>Flights</i>	14	[216, 26964]	[3.1, 5.2]	[19, 40]
<i>Isolet</i>	3	[204, 498834]	[3.1, 6.7]	[27, 40]
<i>Spotify</i>	14	[67, 16867]	[2.6, 4.7]	[17, 40]
<i>Covid19</i>	11	[58011, 185214]	[5.34, 5.38]	[37, 38]
<i>Adult-ACS</i>	11	[345, 421487]	[4.5, 7.2]	[12, 22]

Table 5: Properties of generated rule sets [min, max]

the underlying data. The experiments were run on a Windows 11 laptop with 48GB RAM and 2200 Mhz 12 cores i7 processor.

As default implementation choices for SHARQ, we use the IS score as the rules interestingness measure, and the *max* aggregation for rules set:  $I(R) := \max_{r \in R} IS(r)$ . In Section 5.5 we discuss alternative scoring and aggregations.

**Evaluation Set Construction.** We constructed an evaluation set consisting of 45 different rule mining results with diverse characteristics. Each instance in our evaluation set is a pair  $\langle D, R \rangle$ , containing a dataset and the set of rules extracted from it. We used the following underlying datasets to generate the rules: **Adults** [1], containing 49K rows and 16 columns, **Spotify songs** [37], containing 174K rows and 22 columns, **Flight Delays** [50], containing 5.8M rows and 30 columns, **Isolet** [33], containing 7.8K rows and 617 columns, **Covid-19**[36], containing 316.8K rows and 27 columns, and **Adult-ACS** [70], containing 144.2K rows and 828 columns.

We then used multiple rule mining pipelines on each dataset that included the following steps: (1) sampling the rows, (2) binning numeric columns, (3) running a rule mining tool with a predefined support threshold, and (4) filtering the resulted rules according to their lift score [10].

Note that steps (1) and (2) are necessary for a rule mining algorithm to work properly in a reasonable amount of time. We discarded configurations that took longer than 8 hours to run.

We varied the sample size between 2K and 10K, the number of bins between 3 and 5, the rules support threshold between 0.05 and 0.2, and the lift threshold between 1.05 and 1.2.<sup>4</sup>

Our rule mining pipelines generated a total of 67 distinct rules sets. Table 5 details the characteristics of the rules generated for each dataset in terms of ranges (minimum and maximum) of the number of rules, average rule length, and the number of elements participating in rules ( $\mathcal{E}(R)$ ).

## 5.2 Single Element SHARQ\* Analysis

We first gauge the effectiveness of our single element SHARQ\* algorithm compared to the naive calculation of SHARQ, which instantiates all valid coalitions  $C(e, E)$  as explained in Section 2.2. Recall that by definition  $SHARQ_{(E,R)}(e) = SHARQ^*_{(E,R)}(e)$ , therefore we only examine the efficiency of calculations.

Since the running times and memory consumption of the naive SHARQ calculation were extremely high (taking more than 8 hours for small rules sets with under 1K rules, and up to several days and even more for larger ones.) we compare the number of elements

<sup>4</sup>For lift scores showing negative association ( $\leq 1$ ), we use  $\frac{1}{score}$  before matching with the threshold.

coalitions considered in the calculation rather than running times. As explained in Section 2.2, this is the main factor affecting the running times.

In this series of experiments, we calculated the number of coalitions used by  $SHARQ_{(E,R)}(e)$  and by  $SHARQ^*_{(E,R)}(e)$ , i.e.  $|C(e, E)|$  and  $|C^*(e, E)|$  respectively. This was done for each element  $e \in E$  in each evaluation instance  $\langle D, R \rangle$ , where  $E = \mathcal{E}(R)$  (a total of 1531 executions). Rather than materializing  $|C(e, E)|$ , we used the calculation from our analysis in Section 2.2:  $|C(e, E)| = \prod_{a \in \{attr(E)\} - \{attr(e)\}} (|\mathcal{E}_a| + 1)$ .

The results are depicted in Figure 4; note that the y-axis in all sub-figures use a logarithmic scale. Figure 4a shows the average number of coalitions for a single element  $e$ , grouped by the underlying dataset. The most substantial difference is observed in the *Covid-19* dataset, where the SHARQ\* calculation generated 19.9K coalitions whereas the naive approach generated 483.3M coalitions. The smallest difference occurred in the *Adult-ACS* dataset, where the optimized calculation generated 1.7K coalitions whereas the naive approach generated 6.7M coalitions, on average.

We then investigate how the properties of the mined rule sets affect our computation. Figure 4b shows the average number of coalitions as a function of the number of distinct elements appearing in the rule set. As expected, the number of coalition for the naive SHARQ increases exponentially. This is due to the fact that coalitions are formed from every possible subset of elements, excluding those containing more than one element with the same attribute (as defined in Section 2.2). In contrast, SHARQ\* demonstrates a much slower growth. This is because the optimized set of coalitions  $SHARQ^*_{(E,R)}(e)$  is based on the number and size of rules rather than by the number of distinct elements. While in theory the number of rules can be exponential in the number of elements, in practice it is much smaller.

Next, Figure 4c shows the average number of coalitions as a function of the number of rules in  $R$ . For both the naive SHARQ and SHARQ\* we observe a slight increase in the number of coalitions as the rules set size increases.

Figure 4d shows the average number of coalitions as a function of the average rule length,  $|r|$ , i.e. the number of elements contained in a rule. As expected, for both algorithms, the number of coalitions increases as the rules contain more elements, yet the naive approach utilizes at least three orders of magnitude more coalitions.

As for running times, calculating the SHARQ score for an element using SHARQ\* takes 6.6 seconds, on average, compared to hours and even more if using the naive approach that considers all valid element coalitions (we stopped the computation process after 8 hours of execution).

## 5.3 Multi-element vs Sequential SHARQ\*

In the multi-element setting, we want to calculate SHARQ scores for all elements in a set  $E$ . In this experiment, we therefore investigate the performance of our multi-element SHARQ\* algorithm (Algorithm 2) compared to a *sequential* execution of the single element SHARQ\* (Algorithm 1), computed for each  $e \in E$ , where  $E = \mathcal{E}(R)$ . This time, as both approaches utilizes the optimized SHARQ\* calculation, we can compute actual running times rather than the




Figure 4: Comparison of naive and optimized approaches




Figure 5: Comparison between multi-element and sequential approaches

number of coalitions as done for the naive SHARQ performance evaluation.

Figure 5 shows the running time for calculating SHARQ scores for all elements in  $\mathcal{E}(R)$ , measured across all of our 45  $\langle D, R \rangle$  evaluation instances. First, in Figure 5a, we show the running times of the two solutions, averaged over all rule sets per dataset (i.e., Adult, Flights, Isolet, and Spotify). Observe that the multi-element algorithm achieves a significant improvement over the sequential approach, on average reducing running times by 13.6X (Adult dataset), 17.5X (Flights), 20.4X (Isolet), 16.2X (Spotify), 8X (Adult-ACS) and 12.6X (Covid-19). The average reduction across all 67 instances is 13.8X. Recall from Section 3.3 that the minimal reduction factor of Algorithm 2, the multi-element algorithm, is approximately  $\tau$  (i.e., the maximal rule length). For the Adult, Covid-19, Flights, and Isolet datasets, the maximal rule size is 8, and for the Spotify and Adult-ACS datasets, the maximal rule size is 7. Across all 67 instances, the *minimal* improvement achieved by Algorithm 2 is 6.7X.

To complete the picture, Figures 5b-5d show the running time as a function of the number of elements, the size of the rule set, and the average rule length, respectively. We observe an apparent linear difference between these approaches, especially for complex rule sets with more than 30 elements, 20K rules, and when the average rule length is above 4.5.

#### 5.4 Approximations and Alternative Approaches

In Section 2.1, we described two possible alternative methods for calculating the contribution of an element  $e$  to the interestingness of a rules set  $R$ ,  $I_{TOP}(R)(e)$  and  $Influence(R)(e)$ . While both methods

Baseline	p@10	ap@10	Rank Corr.	Run Time
<b>Alternative Measures for Contribution</b>				
<i>Influence</i>	0.71	0.51	0.76	10.14s
$I_{TOP}$	0.73	0.51	0.67	10.48s
<b>Approximated SHARQ Calculation</b>				
Kernel-Weighting	0.92	0.84	0.93	15.46s
Sobol-Sequence	0.75	0.65	0.85	13.38s
Stratified Sampling	0.74	0.66	0.85	19.38s
Monte-Carlo Anti-thetic	0.73	0.61	0.83	27.82s
Monte Carlo	0.76	0.64	0.82	12.85s

Table 6: SHARQ approximation quality and running times

can be computed more efficiently than SHARQ scores, we showed in Example 1.2 that they fail to adequately capture the difference in the contribution of elements.

In the next set of experiments, our goal is to validate this observation and examine whether  $I_{TOP}$  and *influence* can provide a good *approximation* for the SHARQ. Since both alternative approaches use different calculation methods, we expect their output to be different than SHARQ. We therefore calculate the following metrics, in order to determine how their ranking and top-scoring elements compare to those returned by the SHARQ calculation: (1)  $p@10$ , which compares the top-10 SHARQ elements to the top-10 w.r.t. the baseline score and then calculates  $\frac{\#top-10 \text{ matches}}{10}$ , i.e., the number of matching elements in the two top-10 lists, divided by 10; (2)  $ap@10$ , defined as  $\frac{1}{10} \sum_{k=1}^{10} p@k$ , namely the average  $p@k$  score from 1 to 10 ( $p@k$  generalizes the  $p@10$  measure defined above, for arbitrary values of  $k$ ); and (3) *Spearman Rank Correlation* which measures the

correlation between the *rank order* of the baseline scores compared to the SHARQ scores. We also report the running times of each baseline for computing the scores of all  $\mathcal{E}(R)$  elements.

We compare the alternative contribution calculation methods to five direct SHARQ approximations, previously suggested for Shapley-based calculations [46, 49]. The first is (1) *Shapley kernel weighting*, based on [46], in which permutations are sampled after assigned a weight of  $\frac{|E|-1}{\binom{|E|}{|S|}|S|(|E|-|S|)}$ . The remaining four are permutation sampling techniques suggested in the context of Shapley approximations [49]: (2) *Monte-Carlo*, in which the permutations are sampled i.i.d.; (3) *Antithetic Monte-Carlo*, where half of the permutations are sampled uniformly, and for each randomly-sampled permutation we also take its complement; (4) *Stratified sampling*, another common technique for reducing variance, where we first segment the permutations by size then take a uniform sample from each group; and (5) *Sobol-Sequence Sampling*, which provides a better coverage of the sampled domain by avoiding resampling similar points.

Table 6 first presents the approximation performance of the alternative contribution calculation approaches:  $I_{TOP}$  and Influence, and then gives the results for the direct SHARQ approximations. Observe that all direct SHARQ approximation outperforms both alternative approaches across all approximation quality metrics. Notably, the Shapely kernel weighting method obtains the highest approximation quality, achieving scores of 0.92, 0.84, and 0.93 for p@10, ap@10, and rank correlation, with an overall average running time of 15.46s. In comparison, the alternative contribution methods are faster (10.14s and 10.48s) but have an inferior quality, not exceeding 0.73, 0.51 and 0.76 for p@10, ap@10, and rank correlation. Note that the Sobol-sequence and Monte-carlo approaches obtains better results than  $I_{TOP}$  and *Influence*, with almost the same running times (13.38s and 12.85s) respectively.


These findings suggest that the alternative approaches are *not* good estimators for SHARQ scores, as the direct SHARQ approximations maintain higher accuracy and comparable running times.

In addition to these results which show the deviation in element rankings between SHARQ and alternative contribution scores, we have empirically observed (e.g. in Example 1.2) the inadequacy of  $I_{TOP}$  and *influence* in capturing importance differences between elements. However, a more comprehensive analysis should be conducted using qualitative comparisons, such as case studies, user studies, and quantitative evaluations. This approach has recently been proposed for evaluating and comparing established XAI methods in the context of supervised learning models [57] and autonomous agents [55].

Since SHARQ is, to the best of our knowledge, the first framework for quantifying the importance of elements in an association rule set, we defer the development of such evaluation methods to future work.

## 5.5 SHARQ with alternative notions for rules interestingness

Finally, we consider the effect of using alternative definitions of rules interestingness on the SHARQ scores. Recall that our default



**Figure 6: SHARQ Scores correlation when using alternative interestingness notions.**

configuration uses the IS measure [67] and  $I(R) := \max_{r \in R} \text{score}(r)$  for the aggregated interestingness of a rules set, as defined in Section 2.1.

To gauge this effect, we examine the correlation between element rankings generated by the SHARQ score using different interestingness notions for rules and rule sets. For single rule interestingness, we used (a) *confidence* and (b) *lift* [10] as alternative functions. For rule sets interestingness, we considered (i) *sum*, in which we sum the scores of the rules in the rules set  $R$ ,  $\sum_{r \in R} \text{score}(r)$ ; (ii) *Top-2* and (iii) *Top-3* which return the sum of scores of the top two and three most interesting rules, respectively; and (iv) *average*, calculated as the mean score across the rules in  $R$ .

Figure 6 shows the rank correlation scores, when using alternative interestingness and aggregated interestingness notion, compared to our default configuration. The rank correlation scores are averaged across all 67 instances in our evaluation sets (.95 confidence intervals are depicted in the figure).

Figure 6a shows the rank correlation scores when using alternative interestingness measures. Observe that both confidence and lift scores demonstrate a high rank correlation (0.97 and 0.978, resp.).

Figure 6b shows the correlation scores for each alternative aggregated interestingness scores. The correlation scores range from a low of 0.97 for the *sum* function to a high of 0.99 for the *average*.

This shows that the SHARQ scores are robust and consistent across common definitions for rules and rule set interestingness.

## 6 RELATED WORK

While SHARQ is, to the best of our knowledge, the first framework for explaining association rules mined from relational data, there are several lines of related work that are relevant. We begin by describing existing techniques for analyzing a set of mined association rules, showing that explainability for rules is overlooked. We then present previous work on explaining the results of ML models and database queries, clarifying why such solutions do not help with our problem.

*Analytical tools for analyzing and visualizing association rules.* A plethora of previous work recognizes the challenge of analyzing the results of rule mining tools, which often return thousands of different association rules. To address this, two prominent methods are suggested: (1) *ranking solutions*, which devise dedicated functions to sort the resulting rules by different interestingness criteria; and (2) *visualization solutions*, which provide graphical means to

examine and browse through the resulting rules. None of these solutions, to the best of our knowledge, address the explainability problem of assessing the *contribution* of individual elements to the resulting rules.

(1) *Interestingness functions for ranking and pruning association rules.* Numerous techniques have been devised for *ranking* mined rules according to heuristic notions of *interestingness* [7, 11, 24, 74]. These notions provide a numeric score for each mined rule based on factors such as accuracy, conciseness, reliability, peculiarity, and more (see [25, 74] for surveys). Our framework utilizes such notions of rule interestingness, but rather than measuring the rules themselves, it explains how each individual element *contributes* to these scores.

(2) *Visualization interfaces for rules.* While one can use the notions of interestingness to prune uninteresting rules, the number of remaining rules may still be too large for manual analysis. To address this, works such as [31] suggest keeping a *diverse* set of rules, covering different parts of the dataset; [34, 39] suggest methods for grouping similar rules together, providing a shorter list of more general patterns; and [27, 71] describe visual interfaces for analyzing the mined rules in a matrix-like display, allowing users to examine how items (elements) are connected across multiple rules.

Our explainability framework provides a different way of analyzing the rules, showing which *elements* make the rules interesting. This is achieved by measuring the contribution of individual elements to the interestingness scores of rules. Such information can be used, as discussed in Section 4, to detect redundant rules (i.e. those containing non-influential elements), as well as to examine the importance of *attributes* to the overall interestingness of the mined rules.

*Explainability solutions for machine learning models.* As machine learning models become increasingly complex (e.g., ensemble models, neural networks), there is a growing need for *explaining* model decisions [23]. A multitude of work suggest solutions for post hoc analysis of model predictions [45, 53, 54, 60, 66] (see [42] for a survey). The most prominent method for explaining ML model predictions is by providing an assessment of *feature importance* [45, 53, 56], by calculating the contribution of each feature to the predictive performance of the model—either locally [46, 53] for a single prediction or globally [32, 75] for all model predictions.

In the context of explaining association rules, we follow [46], a highly popular ML explainability framework, and calculate element contribution based on the notion of Shapley Values [58]. However, using Shapley values in our context requires a novel adaptation of the concept as well as dedicated algorithms to speed up the computation, as detailed in Section 3. Without our optimized algorithms, as shown in our experimental evaluation, the calculation of SHARQ is infeasible in most rule-mining settings.

*Explainability solutions for database queries.* Explainability has also been studied within the data management community, focusing primarily on explaining the results of database queries [5, 12, 15, 26]. This is often done by utilizing data provenance and causality-based notions such as intervention and influence to identify tuples whose existence or absence affects the result of the inspected query.

In particular, [17, 43] also use the notion of Shapley values to calculate the importance of database *tuples* to a given query result

set, and devise a dedicated optimization framework to facilitate the expensive computation. Since our work focuses on explaining association rules rather than queries, it requires a different Shapley adaptation and computational framework.

*Assistance tools for Data Analysis.* In a broader sense, our work is a part of an ongoing research effort whose goal is to facilitate the difficult task of analyzing data. To this end, works such as [6, 9, 61, 63] suggest simplified exploration interfaces that allow users to wrangle the data without explicitly writing queries. Other systems automatically produce data visualizations [47, 72] and provide users with general, actionable insights [30, 69] mined from the data. However, none of this work addresses the explainability problem of mined rules.

## 7 CONCLUSIONS

SHARQ is a novel explainability framework for a set of association rules which measures each element’s contribution to the interestingness of the set. The metric is based on the notion of Shapley values, and captures the frequency of the element in the dataset as well as the variability in interestingness across rules of different lengths when the rule is excluded. Since calculating the SHARQ score of an element can be extremely expensive, we give an efficient *SHARQ\** algorithm that is linear in the size of the rule set, and further reduce the cost for a set of elements in a multi-element *SHARQ\** algorithm. We also show two additional use-cases, rule importance and attribute importance. Extensive experiments show the effectiveness of this approach.

In future work, we plan to extend our approach to decision and classification rules, resulting from predictive ML models. We also plan to look at the problem of updates to the data/rule set, and whether SHARQ scores can be incrementally updated.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Adults Income Dataset (UCI). 2024. <https://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml/datasets/Adult/>. (2024).
- [2] Rakesh Agrawal, Tomasz Imieliński, and Arun Swami. 1993. Mining association rules between sets of items in large databases. In *Proceedings of the 1993 ACM SIGMOD international conference on Management of data*. 207–216.
- [3] Rakesh Agrawal, Ramakrishnan Srikant, et al. 1994. Fast algorithms for mining association rules. In *Proc. 20th int. conf. very large data bases, VLDB*, Vol. 1215. Citeseer, 487–499.
- [4] Talha Mahboob Alam, Muhammad Atif Iqbal, Yasir Ali, Abdul Wahab, Safdar Ijaz, Talha Imtiaz Baig, Ayaz Hussain, Muhammad Awais Malik, Muhammad Mehdi Raza, Salman Ibrar, et al. 2019. A model for early prediction of diabetes. *Informatics in Medicine Unlocked* 16 (2019), 100204.
- [5] Yael Amerdamer, Daniel Deutch, and Val Tannen. 2011. Provenance for aggregate queries. In *Proceedings of the thirtieth ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGART symposium on Principles of database systems*. 153–164.
- [6] Zhifeng Bao, Yong Zeng, HV Jagadish, and Tok Wang Ling. 2015. Exploratory keyword search with interactive input. In *Proceedings of the 2015 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data*. 871–876.
- [7] Roberto J Bayardo Jr and Rakesh Agrawal. 1999. Mining the most interesting rules. In *Proceedings of the fifth ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*. 145–154.
- [8] Leopoldo Bertossi, Benny Kimelfeld, Ester Livshits, and Mikaël Monet. 2023. The Shapley value in database management. *ACM Sigmod Record* 52, 2 (2023), 6–17.
- [9] Ramon Beshpinyowong, Wei Chen, HV Jagadish, and Yuxin Ma. 2016. ExRank: An exploratory ranking interface. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 9, 13 (2016), 1529–1532.
- [10] Sergey Brin, Rajeev Motwani, and Craig Silverstein. 1997. Beyond market baskets: Generalizing association rules to correlations. In *Proceedings of the 1997 ACM SIGMOD international conference on Management of data*. 265–276.
- [11] Sergey Brin, Rajeev Motwani, Jeffrey D Ullman, and Shalom Tsur. 1997. Dynamic itemset counting and implication rules for market basket data. In *Proceedings of the 1997 ACM SIGMOD international conference on Management of data*. 255–264.
- [12] P. Buneman, S. Khanna, and W.C. Tan. 2001. Why and Where: A Characterization of Data Provenance. In *ICDT*. 316–330.
- [13] Varun Chandola and Vipin Kumar. 2007. Summarization—compressing data into an informative representation. *Knowledge and Information Systems* 12, 3 (2007), 355–378.
- [14] X Chang, H Li, Y Fu, and D Yang. 2018. Knowledge-Based Error Detection in External Beam Physician Orders Using Association Rules. *International Journal of Radiation Oncology, Biology, Physics* 102, 3 (2018), S119–S120.
- [15] Adriane Chapman and HV Jagadish. 2009. Why not?. In *Proceedings of the 2009 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of data*. 523–534.
- [16] Chad Creighton and Samir Hanash. 2003. Mining gene expression databases for association rules. *Bioinformatics* 19, 1 (2003), 79–86.
- [17] Susan Davidson, Daniel Deutch, Nave Frost, Benny Kimelfeld, Omer Koren, and Mikaël Monet. 2022. ShapGraph: An Holistic View of Explanations through Provenance Graphs and Shapley Values. In *Proceedings of the 2022 International Conference on Management of Data*. 2373–2376.
- [18] Susan B. Davidson, Daniel Deutch, Nave Frost, Benny Kimelfeld, Omer Koren, and Mikaël Monet. 2022. ShapGraph: An Holistic View of Explanations through Provenance Graphs and Shapley Values. In *SIGMOD '22: International Conference on Management of Data, Philadelphia, PA, USA, June 12 - 17, 2022*, Zachary Ives, Angela Bonifati, and Amr El Abbadi (Eds.). ACM, 2373–2376. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3514221.3520172>
- [19] Daniel Deutch, Nave Frost, Amir Gilad, and Oren Sheffer. 2021. Explanations for data repair through shapley values. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management*. 362–371.
- [20] Daniel Deutch, Amir Gilad, Tova Milo, and Amit Somech. 2020. ExplainED: explanations for EDA notebooks. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 13, 12 (2020), 2917–2920.
- [21] Jose A Diaz-Garcia, M Dolores Ruiz, and Maria J Martin-Bautista. 2022. A survey on the use of association rules mining techniques in textual social media. *Artificial Intelligence Review* (2022), 1–26.
- [22] Onur Dogan, Furkan Can Kem, and Basar Oztaysi. 2022. Fuzzy association rule mining approach to identify e-commerce product association considering sales amount. *Complex & Intelligent Systems* 8, 2 (2022), 1551–1560.
- [23] Finale Doshi-Velez and Been Kim. 2017. Towards a rigorous science of interpretable machine learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.08608* (2017).
- [24] Alex A Freitas. 1998. On objective measures of rule surprisingness. In *European Symposium on Principles of Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*. Springer, 1–9.
- [25] Liqiang Geng and Howard J Hamilton. 2006. Interestingness measures for data mining: A survey. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)* 38, 3 (2006), 9–es.
- [26] T.J. Green, G. Karvounarakis, and V. Tannen. 2007. Provenance semirings. In *PODS*. 31–40.
- [27] Michael Hahsler and Radoslaw Karpienko. 2017. Visualizing association rules in hierarchical groups. *Journal of Business Economics* 87, 3 (2017), 317–335.
- [28] Jiawei Han, Jian Pei, and Yiwen Yin. 2000. Mining frequent patterns without candidate generation. *ACM sigmod record* 29, 2 (2000), 1–12.
- [29] Robert J Hilderaman and Howard J Hamilton. 2013. *Knowledge discovery and measures of interest*. Vol. 638. Springer Science & Business Media.
- [30] Hao Huang, Qian Yan, Wei Lu, Huaizhong Lin, Yunjun Gao, and Lei Chen. 2019. LERI: Local Exploration for Rare-Category Identification. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* 32, 9 (2019), 1761–1772.
- [31] Richard A Huebner. 2009. Diversity-based interestingness measures for association rule mining. *Proceedings of ASBBS* 16, 1 (2009).
- [32] Mark Ibrahim, Melissa Louie, Ceena Modarres, and John Paisley. 2019. Global explanations of neural networks: Mapping the landscape of predictions. In *Proceedings of the 2019 AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*. 279–287.
- [33] ISOLET Dataset (UCI). 2024. <https://archive.ics.uci.edu/dataset/54/isolet>. (2024).
- [34] Szymon Jaroszewicz and Dan A Simovici. 2002. Pruning redundant association rules using maximum entropy principle. In *Pacific-Asia Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. Springer, 135–147.
- [35] Neil Jethani, Mukund Sudarshan, Ian Connick Covert, Su-In Lee, and Rajesh Ranganath. 2021. FastSHAP: Real-Time Shapley Value Estimation. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [36] COVID-19 Symptoms (Kaggle). 2020. <https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/iamhungundji/covid19-symptoms-checker>. (2020).
- [37] Spotify Dataset (Kaggle). 2024. <https://www.kaggle.com/mrmorj/dataset-of-songs-in-spotify>. (2024).
- [38] Satya Katragadda, Raju Gottumukkala, Ravi Teja Bhupatiraju, Azmyin Md Kamal, Vijay Raghavan, Henry Chu, Ramesh Kolluru, and Ziad Ashkar. 2021. Association mining based approach to analyze COVID-19 response and case growth in the United States. *Scientific Reports* 11, 1 (2021), 1–12.
- [39] Brian Lent, Arun Swami, and Jennifer Widom. 1997. Clustering association rules. In *Proceedings 13th International Conference on Data Engineering*. IEEE, 220–231.
- [40] Zhi Li, Xuyi Li, Runhua Tang, and Lin Zhang. 2021. Apriori algorithm for the data mining of global cyberspace security issues for human participatory based on association rules. *Frontiers in Psychology* 11 (2021), 582480.
- [41] Song Lin and Donald E Brown. 2006. An outlier-based data association method for linking criminal incidents. *Decision Support Systems* 41, 3 (2006), 604–615.
- [42] Pantelis Linardatos, Vasilis Papastefanopoulos, and Sotiris Kotsiantis. 2021. Explainable ai: A review of machine learning interpretability methods. *Entropy* 23, 1 (2021), 18.
- [43] Ester Livshits, Leopoldo Bertossi, Benny Kimelfeld, and Moshe Sebag. 2019. The Shapley value of tuples in query answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.08679* (2019).
- [44] Scott M Lundberg, Gabriel Erion, Hugh Chen, Alex DeGrave, Jordan M Prutkin, Bala Nair, Ronit Katz, Jonathan Himmelfarb, Nisha Bansal, and Su-In Lee. 2020. From local explanations to global understanding with explainable AI for trees. *Nature machine intelligence* 2, 1 (2020), 56–67.
- [45] Scott M Lundberg and Su-In Lee. 2017. A Unified Approach to Interpreting Model Predictions. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 30, I. Guyon, U. V. Luxburg, S. Bengio, H. Wallach, R. Fergus, S. Vishwanathan, and R. Garnett (Eds.). Curran Associates, Inc., 4765–4774. <http://papers.nips.cc/paper/7062-a-unified-approach-to-interpreting-model-predictions.pdf>
- [46] Scott M Lundberg and Su-In Lee. 2017. A Unified Approach to Interpreting Model Predictions. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 30. 4765–4774.
- [47] Yuyu Luo, Xuedi Qin, Nan Tang, and Guoliang Li. 2018. DeepEye: Towards Automatic Data Visualization. ICDE.
- [48] Wes McKinney. 2010. Data Structures for Statistical Computing in Python. In *Proceedings of the 9th Python in Science Conference*, Stéfan van der Walt and Jarrod Millman (Eds.). 51 – 56.
- [49] Rory Mitchell, Joshua Cooper, Eibe Frank, and Geoffrey Holmes. 2022. Sampling permutations for shapley value estimation. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 23, 43 (2022), 1–46.
- [50] United States Department of Transportation. 2015. 2015 Flight Delays and Cancellations. <https://www.kaggle.com/usdot/flight-delays>. (2015).
- [51] Judea Pearl et al. 2009. Causal inference in statistics: An overview. *Statistics surveys* 3 (2009), 96–146.
- [52] SHARQ Github Repository. 2024. <https://anonymous.4open.science/r/SHARQ-0EC4>. (2024).
- [53] Marco Tulio Ribeiro, Sameer Singh, and Carlos Guestrin. 2016. "Why should I trust you?" Explaining the predictions of any classifier. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery and data mining*. 1135–1144.
- [54] Marco Tulio Ribeiro, Sameer Singh, and Carlos Guestrin. 2018. Anchors: High-precision model-agnostic explanations. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, Vol. 32.
- [55] Avi Rosenfeld. 2021. Better metrics for evaluating explainable artificial intelligence. In *Proceedings of the 20th international conference on autonomous agents and multiagent systems*. 45–50.
- [56] Mirka Saarela and Susanne Jauhiainen. 2021. Comparison of feature importance measures as explanations for classification models. *SN Applied Sciences* 3, 2

- (2021), 272.
- [57] Ahmed M Salih, Zahra Raisi-Estabragh, Ilaria Boscolo Galazzo, Petia Radeva, Steffen E Petersen, Karim Lekadir, and Gloria Menegaz. 2024. A Perspective on Explainable Artificial Intelligence Methods: SHAP and LIME. *Advanced Intelligent Systems* (2024), 2400304.
  - [58] LS SHAPLEY. 1953. A value for n-person games. *Contributions to the Theory of Games* 28 (1953), 307–317.
  - [59] L. S. Shapley. 1953. *17. A Value for n-Person Games*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, 307–318. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1515/9781400881970-018>
  - [60] Avanti Shrikumar, Peyton Greenside, and Anshul Kundaje. 2017. Learning important features through propagating activation differences. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 3145–3153.
  - [61] Manish Singh, Michael J Cafarella, and HV Jagadish. 2016. DBExplorer: Exploratory Search in Databases. *EDBT* (2016).
  - [62] R. Srikant and R. Agrawal. 1997. Mining generalized association rules. *Future Gener. Comput. Syst.* 13, 2 (1997).
  - [63] Arjun Srinivasan, Steven M Drucker, Alex Endert, and John Stasko. 2018. Augmenting visualizations with interactive data facts to facilitate interpretation and communication. *IEEE transactions on visualization and computer graphics* 25, 1 (2018), 672–681.
  - [64] Erik Štrumbelj and Igor Kononenko. 2014. Explaining prediction models and individual predictions with feature contributions. *Knowledge and information systems* 41, 3 (2014), 647–665.
  - [65] Grażyna Suchacka and Grzegorz Chodak. 2017. Using association rules to assess purchase probability in online stores. *Information Systems and e-Business Management* 15, 3 (2017), 751–780.
  - [66] Mukund Sundararajan, Ankur Taly, and Qiqi Yan. 2017. Axiomatic attribution for deep networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 3319–3328.
  - [67] Pang-Ning Tan and Vipin Kumar. 2000. Interestingness measures for association patterns: A perspective. (2000).
  - [68] Meera Tandan, Yogesh Acharya, Suresh Pokharel, and Mohan Timilsina. 2021. Discovering symptom patterns of COVID-19 patients using association rule mining. *Computers in biology and medicine* 131 (2021), 104249.
  - [69] Bo Tang, Shi Han, Man Lung Yiu, Rui Ding, and Dongmei Zhang. 2017. Extracting top-k insights from multi-dimensional data. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM International Conference on Management of Data*. 1509–1524.
  - [70] U.S. Census Bureau . 2024. Annual Social and Economic Supplements. <https://www.census.gov/data/datasets/time-series/demo/cps/cps-asec.html>. (2024).
  - [71] Pak Chung Wong, Paul Whitney, and Jim Thomas. 1999. Visualizing association rules for text mining. In *Proceedings 1999 IEEE Symposium on Information Visualization (InfoVis' 99)*. IEEE, 120–123.
  - [72] Kanit Wongsuphasawat, Dominik Moritz, Anushka Anand, Jock Mackinlay, Bill Howe, and Jeffrey Heer. 2016. Voyager: Exploratory analysis via faceted browsing of visualization recommendations. *TVCG* (2016).
  - [73] Eugene Wu and Samuel Madden. 2013. Scorpion: Explaining away outliers in aggregate queries. (2013).
  - [74] Yuejin Zhang, Lingling Zhang, Guangli Nie, and Yong Shi. 2009. A survey of interestingness measures for association rules. In *2009 International Conference on Business Intelligence and Financial Engineering*. IEEE, 460–463.
  - [75] Alexander Zien, Nicole Krämer, Sören Sonnenburg, and Gunnar Rättsch. 2009. The feature importance ranking measure. In *Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases: European Conference, ECML PKDD 2009, Bled, Slovenia, September 7-11, 2009, Proceedings, Part II 20*. Springer, 694–709.