
SHAP-IQ: Unified Approximation of any-order Shapley Interactions

Fabian Fumagalli^{*1} Maximilian Muschalik^{*23} Patrick Kolpaczki⁴ Eyke Hüllermeier²³ Barbara Hammer¹

Abstract

Predominately in explainable artificial intelligence (XAI) research, the Shapley value (SV) is applied to determine feature importance scores for any black box model. Shapley interaction indices extend the Shapley value to define any-order feature interaction scores. Defining a unique Shapley interaction index is an open research question and, so far, three definitions have been proposed, which differ by their choice of axioms. Moreover, each definition requires a specific approximation technique. We, however, propose SHAPley Interaction Quantification (SHAP-IQ), an efficient sampling-based approximator to compute Shapley interactions for all three definitions, as well as all other that satisfy the linearity, symmetry and dummy axiom. SHAP-IQ is based on a novel representation and, in contrast to existing methods, we provide theoretical guarantees for its approximation quality, as well as estimates for the variance of the point estimates. For the special case of SV, our approach reveals a novel representation of the SV and corresponds to Unbiased KernelSHAP with a greatly simplified calculation. We illustrate the computational efficiency and effectiveness by explaining state-of-the-art language models among high-dimensional synthetic models.

1. Introduction

Feature importance scores are the prevalent approach to interpret black box machine learning (ML) models (Adadi & Berrada, 2018; Chen et al., 2022; Lundberg & Lee, 2017). However, in many real world applications, such as understanding drug-drug interactions, mutational events or complex language models, quantifying the amount of *interac-*

tions between features is paramount. Feature interaction scores provide a more comprehensive explanation, which can be seen as an enrichment of feature importance scores. In this work, we are interested in feature interaction scores that make use of the Shapley value (SV) and its extension to Shapley interactions.

The SV is a concept from cooperative game theory that has been used, apart from feature importance scores (Chen et al., 2022), as a basis for many Shapley-based explanations (Jia et al., 2019; Ghorbani & Zou, 2019; Yeh et al., 2018). It captivates through uniqueness given a set of intuitive axioms. While, in contrast to SV, a “natural” extension of the intuitive set of axioms for a unique Shapley interaction index is less clear, it is also more challenging to approximate Shapley interaction scores, where approximation methods, so far, are specifically tailored to the particular definition.

In this paper, we, instead, consider a very general (ambiguous) notion of Shapley interaction indices, referred to as SI, which covers all currently proposed definitions and all other that satisfy the (generalized) linearity, symmetry and dummy axiom. Given this general definition of SI, we focus on an approximation method that can be used regardless of the concrete choice of definition and introduce SHAPley Interaction Quantification (SHAP-IQ), an efficient sampling-based estimator of SI. Before we formally state our contribution, we first review the related work.

Related Work The Shapley Interaction Index (SII) (Grabisch & Roubens, 1999), the Shapley Taylor Interaction (STI) (Sundararajan et al., 2020) and the Faithful Shapley Interaction Index (FSI) (Tsai et al., 2022) offer three unique ways of extending the SV to interactions, which extend on the linearity, symmetry and dummy axiom to provide a uniquely defined interaction index. SII and STI extend on axiomatic properties of the weighted sum for SV (Shapley, 1953), whereas FSI extends on the axiomatic properties of the Shapley interactions as the solution to a weighted least square solution (Ruiz et al., 1996; 1998).

In the field of cooperative game theory, interactions have also been studied from a theoretical perspective as the solution of a weighted least square problem and the sum of marginal contributions with constant weights, which both yield a generalized Banzhaf value (Hammer & Holzman,

^{*}Equal contribution ¹Bielefeld University, D-33615 Bielefeld, Germany ²LMU Munich, D-80539 Munich, Germany ³Munich Center for Machine Learning (MCML) ⁴Paderborn University, D-33098 Paderborn, Germany. Correspondence to: Fabian Fumagalli <ffumagalli@techfak.uni-bielefeld.de>, Maximilian Muschalik <Maximilian.Muschalik@lmu.de>.

1992; Grabisch et al., 2000).

In the ML community, interactions of features have been studied from a practical perspective for text (Murdoch et al., 2018) and image (Tsang et al., 2020a) data, for specific models, such as neural networks (Tsang et al., 2018; Cui et al., 2020; Singh et al., 2019; Janizek et al., 2021) or tree based models (Lundberg et al., 2020). Other concepts of interactions have been discussed in (Tsang et al., 2020b) using marginal contributions, from a statistical perspective with functional decomposition (Molnar et al., 2019) and Lou et al. (2013) improved white box models with interaction terms.

To approximate SII and STI, a permutation-based method (Sundararajan et al., 2020; Tsai et al., 2022), as an extension of Castro et al. (2009), was suggested, whereas FSI relies on a kernel-based approximation, called KernelSHAP (Lundberg & Lee, 2017), which utilizes a representation of SV as the solution of a weighted least square problem (Charnes et al., 1988). Our approximation of SI is related to Unbiased KernelSHAP (Covert & Lee, 2021), which is a variant of KernelSHAP. It is further related to stratified sampling approximations for SV (Maleki et al., 2013) and our sampling approach can be seen as flexible framework to find the optimum allocation for each stratum (Castro et al., 2017).

Contribution Our main contributions include:

- We consider a general form of Shapley interactions, referred to as SI (Definition 2.3) and establish a novel representation of SI (Theorem 3.1), which also yields an efficiency property for SII (Proposition 3.10).
- Based on this representation, we introduce SHAP-IQ (Definition 3.2), an efficient sampling-based SI estimator. SHAP-IQ can be applied to any definition of Shapley interactions satisfying the linearity, symmetry and dummy axiom, including SII, STI and FSI. A comparison of SHAP-IQ can be found in Table 3.1.
- In the special case of SV, SHAP-IQ reveals a novel representation of the SV (Theorem 3.5) and corresponds directly to Unbiased KernelSHAP (Theorem 3.7) (Covert & Lee, 2021) with a greatly simplified representation.
- We apply SHAP-IQ on a language model and multiple synthetic models and show that SHAP-IQ outperforms the baseline for SII and STI in almost all real-world settings. For FSI, SHAP-IQ performs comparably with the baseline, but provides theoretical guarantees as well as other benefits (see Table 3.1).

2. Shapley-based Explanations

In this section, we review Shapley-based explanations and introduce our general definition of Shapley interactions, which we aim to approximate in Section 3. We introduce existing baseline methods for Shapley interactions and Unbiased KernelSHAP for the SV, which is linked to our proposed method.

Shapley-based explanations consider a supervised learning scenario where a model is trained on a set of features D . The goal is to examine a *model behavior* ν and evaluate the contributions for individual features or groups of features. The model behavior ν could, for instance, be a particular model prediction for one input (local explanation) or an overall measure of model performance (global explanation) (Covert et al., 2021). To quantify the contribution for individual features, the change in model behavior is evaluated, if the feature is removed from the model. Therefore, the model behavior is considered as a function on the power set $\mathcal{P}(D)$ of D , i.e. $\nu : \mathcal{P}(D) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. To restrict a ML model on a subset of features, different *feature removal* techniques have been proposed, such as marginalization of features or retraining the model (Covert et al., 2021). To quantify the impact of a single feature $i \in D$ on the model behavior ν it is then intuitive to compute the difference $\delta_{\{i\}}^\nu(T) = \nu(T \cup \{i\}) - \nu(T)$ for subsets $T \subset D \setminus \{i\}$.

For a distinct pair of features (i, j) with $i, j \in D$, a natural extension is $\delta_{\{i,j\}}^\nu(T) = \nu(T \cup \{i, j\}) - \nu(T) - \delta_{\{i\}}^\nu(T) - \delta_{\{j\}}^\nu(T)$ for $T \in D \setminus \{i, j\}$, i.e. subtracting the contribution of single features from the joint impact of both features. The following definition generalizes this recursion.

Definition 2.1 (Marginal Contribution). The *marginal contribution* for $S \subset D$ for $T \subset D \setminus S$ is defined as

$$\delta_S^\nu(T) := \sum_{L \subset S} (-1)^{s-l} \nu(T \cup L),$$

where lower case letters correspond to the subset sizes.

To obtain an importance score, the marginal contributions on different subsets $T \subset D \setminus S$ are aggregated using a specific *summary technique*. Recent work (Covert et al., 2021) summarized removal-based explanations in a unified framework by identifying the three key components: Feature removal, model behavior and summary technique. In this work, we are interested in the approximation and extension of one particular summary technique for single features, called the Shapley value (SV) (Shapley, 1953), independent of model behavior and feature removal.

Definition 2.2 (SV). The SV for $i \in D$ is defined as

$$\phi(i) = \sum_{T \subset D \setminus \{i\}} \frac{(d-t-1)!t!}{d!} \delta_{\{i\}}^\nu(T).$$

The SV is the unique attribution method that fulfills the following axioms: symmetry (importances are independent of feature ordering), linearity (in terms of the model behavior ν), dummy (if a feature does not change ν then its importance is zero) and efficiency (the sum of importances are equal to $\nu(D) - \nu(\emptyset)$) (Shapley, 1953). The SV yields a unique attribution measure but does not give any information about the interactions between two or more features.

To define a *higher order* SV, referred to as *Shapley Interaction* (SI), the *Shapley Interaction Index* (SII) (Grabisch & Roubens, 1999), the *Shapley-Taylor Interaction* (STI) (Sundararajan et al., 2020) and the *Faithful Shapley Interaction* (FSI) (Tsai et al., 2022) have been proposed. STI and FSI require a fixed *maximum interaction order* s_0 and are defined for interactions $S \subset D$ with $|S| \leq s_0$. In this paper, we consider a fixed s_0 and focus on *top-order interactions*, i.e. $S \subset D$ with $|S| = s_0$. All definitions incorporate the SV as a special case, i.e. for $s_0 = 1$, differ by their choice of axioms and are provably unique for their particular set of axioms. We summarize all proposed methods in the following (general) SI definition.

Definition 2.3 (SI). For maximum interaction order s_0 and an interaction $S \subset D$ with $|S| = s_0$, the top-order SI with weights $m_{s_0}(t)$ is defined as

$$I^{m_{s_0}}(S) := \sum_{T \subset D \setminus S} m_{s_0}(t) \delta_S^\nu(T),$$

such that $m_1(t) = \frac{(d-t-1)!t!}{d!}$ and the generalized linearity, symmetry and dummy axioms are fulfilled.

Remark 2.4. It has been shown that for any Shapley interaction index satisfying the (generalized) axioms of linearity, symmetry and dummy, there exists a SI representation (Grabisch & Roubens, 1999).

The condition on $m_1(t)$ thereby ensures that the SI reduces to the SV, if $|S| = s_0 = 1$. For STI and FSI, m_{s_0} depends on the maximum interaction order s_0 , which we assume is fixed and omit for readability. To obtain a unique SI index, SII is further based on a recursive axiom, while STI and FSI are based on a generalized efficiency axiom with an additional interaction distribution axiom (STI) or a faithfulness property (FSI). For details on the axioms and exact definitions, we refer to Appendix A.

By definition, the number of evaluations of ν in ϕ and I^m , which constitutes the limiting factor in ML, grows exponentially with d and thus, in practice, sampling-based approximation methods are required.

2.1. Approximations of SI

Current approximations of SI are distinguished in permutation-based approximation (SII and STI) and kernel-based approximation (FSI). Both extend on existing meth-

ods for the SV, namely permutation sampling (Castro et al., 2009) for SII and STI, and KernelSHAP (Lundberg & Lee, 2017) for FSI. For a comprehensive overview of the original methods, we refer to Appendix B.

Permutation-based Approximation for STI and SII.

Permutation-based (PB) approximation is based on a representation of the SI as an average over all permutations

$$I^m(S) = \frac{1}{d!} \sum_{\pi \in \mathfrak{S}_D} g_\nu^m(S, \pi) = \mathbb{E}_{\pi \sim \text{unif}(\mathfrak{S}_D)} [g_\nu^m(S, \pi)].$$

Given the representation over permutations (Sundararajan et al., 2020; Tsai et al., 2022), SI can then be approximated by the PB estimator.

Definition 2.5 (PB Estimator). Given random permutations $\pi_1, \dots, \pi_K \sim \text{unif}(\mathfrak{S}_D)$ the *PB estimator* is defined as

$$\hat{I}_{\text{PB}}^m(S) := \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K g_\nu^m(S, \pi_k),$$

where $g_\nu^{\text{STI}}(S, \pi) := \delta_S^\nu(u_S^-(\pi))$ and $g_\nu^{\text{SII}}(S, \pi) := \mathbf{1}(S \in \pi) \delta_S^\nu(u_S^-(\pi))$. Here, $u_S^-(\pi)$ refers to the set of indices in π preceding the first occurrence of any element of S in π and $\mathbf{1}(S \in \pi)$ is equal to one, if all elements of S are found as a sequence in π .

The PB algorithms for SII and STI are outlined in Appendix E.1.1.

Kernel-based (KB) Approximation for FSI. As for the SV (Charnes et al., 1988), recent work (Tsai et al., 2022) showed that the interactions $\mathcal{S} := \{S \subset D : s \leq s_0\}$ with $d_{s_0} := |S|$ of FSI can be represented as the solution of a constrained weighted least square problem

$$I^{m_{\text{FSI}}} = \arg \min_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{s_0}}} \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_1} \mu_{Sh}(t) \left(\nu(T) - \sum_{\substack{S \in \mathcal{S} \\ S \subset T}} \beta(S) \right)^2 \quad (1)$$

s.t. $\sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \beta(S) = \nu(D)$ and $\beta(\emptyset) = \nu(\emptyset)$,

where $\mu_{Sh}(t) := \frac{1}{d-1} \binom{d-2}{t-1}^{-1}$ and $\mathcal{T}_k := \{T \subset D : k \leq t \leq d-k\}$ is the set of all subsets with sizes between k and $d-k$. Similar to KernelSHAP (Lundberg & Lee, 2017), it was suggested to solve the optimization problem for a collection of subsets.

¹Note that Tsai et al. (2022) and KernelSHAP (Lundberg & Lee, 2017) rely on an equivalent scaled variant of $\mu_{Sh}(t)$.

Definition 2.6 (KB Estimator). Given a collection of subsets $T_1, \dots, T_K \in \mathcal{T}_1$, the *KB estimator* is defined as

$$\hat{I}_{\text{KB}}^{\text{mFSI}} := \arg \min_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{s_0}}} \sum_{k=1}^K \mu_{Sh}(t_k) \left(\nu(T_k) - \sum_{\substack{S \in \mathcal{S} \\ S \subset T_k}} \beta(S) \right)^2$$

s.t. $\sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \beta(S) = \nu(D)$ and $\beta(\emptyset) = \nu(\emptyset)$,

The KB estimator can be numerically computed using the least square solution and including $\{\emptyset, D\}$ with weights $\mu_{Sh}(0) = \mu_{Sh}(d) = \infty$ set to a high positive constant (Lundberg & Lee, 2017; Tsai et al., 2022). Details on the implementation can be found in Appendix E.1.2.

To construct a collection of subsets, the implementation of KernelSHAP² determines a *sampling order* k_0 , such that subsets with $k_0 \leq t \leq d - k_0$ are sampled from $p(T) \propto \mu_{Sh}(t)$ and for $t < k_0$ or $t > d - k_0$ all possible subsets are used (Lundberg & Lee, 2017). The sampling order k_0 is thereby found by successively comparing the expected number of subsets with the total number of subsets of that size. As the number of subsets $\binom{d}{t}$ grows towards the middle, and $\binom{d}{t} = \binom{d}{d-t}$ the implementation starts the comparison from the edges and iteratively increases the k_0 candidate. For more details and pseudo code, we refer to Appendix C.1.

2.2. Computational Complexity of SI Approximation

To evaluate one permutation for STI, the PB algorithm requires 2^s model evaluations per interaction, i.e. in total $\binom{d}{s} \cdot 2^s$. With each evaluated permutation all interaction estimates can be updated. For SII, the complexity is $(d-s+1) \cdot 2^s$ per permutation and only interaction estimates with $S \in \pi$ can be updated per permutation, i.e. $d-s+1$ interaction estimates with one permutation. This constitutes a significant drawback over the PB approximations for SV, which iterates only once through the permutation requiring $d-1$ evaluations to update all estimates of the SV. In contrast, as for SV, the KB approach of FSI allows to update all interaction estimates using *one single* model evaluation. However, the KB approach of FSI always requires to estimate *all* interactions with order $s \leq s_0$ and its computational effort increases non-linear with the number of subsets used, as solving the weighted least square problem requires inverting a $K \times d_{s_0}$ matrix. For an overview of the benefits and drawbacks of each method, we again refer to Table 3.1.

²<https://github.com/slundberg/shap>

2.3. Unbiased KernelSHAP (U-KSH)

We now introduce U-KSH (Covert & Lee, 2021), an estimator of the SV, where we will show (Theorem 3.7) that for the SV and a suitable sampling scheme our approach corresponds to U-KSH with a greatly simplified representation. U-KSH was motivated as a variant of KernelSHAP (KSH) (Lundberg & Lee, 2017), which relies on the same optimization objective as KB approximation. In contrast to KSH, U-KSH is theoretically well understood and it was shown that the estimator is unbiased and consistent (Covert & Lee, 2021). U-KSH solves (1) with $s_0 = 1$ and a probability distribution over the binary representations Z of subsets $p(T) \propto \mu_{Sh}(t)$ over \mathcal{T}_1 as

$$\phi = A^{-1} \left(b - \mathbf{1} \frac{\mathbf{1}^T A^{-1} b - \nu_0(\mathbf{1})}{\mathbf{1}^T A^{-1} \mathbf{1}} \right),$$

where $A := \mathbb{E}[ZZ^T]$ and $b = \mathbb{E}[Z\nu_0(Z)]$ and $\nu_0(Z) := \nu(Z) - \nu(\mathbf{0})$. U-KSH then approximates this solution using a Monte-Carlo estimate.

Definition 2.7 (U-KSH). Given a collection of sampled subsets $T_1, \dots, T_K \sim p(T) \propto \mu_{Sh}(t)$ with binary representation $Z_1, \dots, Z_K \in \{0, 1\}^d$, the *Unbiased KernelSHAP* (U-KSH) estimator is defined as

$$\hat{\phi}_U := A^{-1} \left(\hat{b} - \mathbf{1} \frac{\mathbf{1}^T A^{-1} \hat{b} - \nu_0(\mathbf{1})}{\mathbf{1}^T A^{-1} \mathbf{1}} \right),$$

where $\hat{b} := \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K Z_k \nu_0(Z_k)$.

The main idea of U-KSH is that A can be computed explicitly independent of ν and only b has to be estimated. We will show in Theorem 3.7 that the representation of $\hat{\phi}_U$ can be greatly simplified to a weighted sum. The proof relies on the observation that also A^{-1} can be explicitly stated, which allows to compute all terms in $\hat{\phi}_U$.

3. SHAP-IQ: Unified Approximation of any-order SI

So far, approximations of SI are dependent on the particular definition and it is unclear if these approaches can be extended to our general SI definition. Furthermore, PB approximation for SII and STI is very inefficient as each update of all estimates requires a significant number of model evaluations. KB approximation for FSI efficiently updates estimates, it is, however, impossible to compute only a selection of interaction estimates and theoretical results for the estimator are difficult to establish. In the following, we introduce SHAP-IQ, a unified sampling-based approximation method that can be used for our general SI definition. SHAP-IQ is based on a Monte-Carlo estimate of a novel representation of the SI and well-known statistical results can be applied on the estimator. In the special case of SV,

Table 1. Comparison of permutation-based (PB) and kernel-based (KB) approximation with SHAP-IQ. For modeling scenarios, we indicate with \checkmark our recommended method to use.

	PB	KB	SHAP-IQ
Approximation of	SII,STI	FSI	ALL (SI)
Theoretical guarantees	\checkmark	\times	\checkmark
Update all with one model evaluation	\times	\checkmark	\checkmark
Complexity linear in model evaluations	\checkmark	\times	\checkmark
Single interactions	(\checkmark)	\times	\checkmark
Sparse linear setting	\checkmark	\checkmark	\times
Dense linear setting	\times	\times	\checkmark
Machine Learning	\times	\checkmark	\checkmark

we find a novel representation of the SV and show that SHAP-IQ is U-KSH, if the subsets are chosen similarly. SHAP-IQ therefore greatly reduces the computational complexity of U-KSH. As SHAP-IQ maintains the efficiency property for the SV, we introduce s-efficiency, which ensures that the sum of all estimates of SHAP-IQ remains constant for higher order interactions. Finally, we show that SII and STI are s-efficient and find an efficiency property of SII, whose analysis we leave to future research. For an overview of the benefits and drawbacks of SHAP-IQ, we again refer to Table 3.1.

3.1. SHAPley Interaction Quantification (SHAP-IQ)

A key challenge in approximating SV and SI efficiently is that the sum changes for every interaction subset S . We thus first establish a novel representation of SI. Based on this representation, we find SHAP-IQ, an efficient estimator of SI. We show that SHAP-IQ is unbiased, consistent and provide a general approximation bound. All proofs can be found in Appendix D.1.

Our novel representation of SI is defined as a sum over all subsets $T \subset D$.

Theorem 3.1. *The SI can be represented as*

$$I^m(S) = \sum_{T \subset D} \nu_0(T) \gamma^m(t, |T \cap S|)$$

with $\gamma^m(t, k) := (-1)^{s-k} m(t-k)$.

Theorem 3.1 yields a novel representation of SI, where the model evaluations $\nu_0(T)$ are independent of S . This allows to utilize every model evaluation to compute all SI scores simultaneously by properly weighting with γ^m . Notably, our

representation relies on ν_0 instead of ν , which constitutes an important choice, on which we elaborate in Appendix D.1.

To approximate I^m we propose to explicitly compute low-cardinality subset sizes for $t < k_0$ and $t > d - k_0$ summarized in $c_{k_0}(S) := \sum_{T \notin \mathcal{T}_{k_0}} \nu_0(T) \gamma^m(t, |T \cap S|)$, which we refer to as the deterministic part. For the remaining subsets, i.e. $T \in \mathcal{T}_{k_0}$, we use a sampling-based approximation and refer to k_0 as the *sampling order*. For the sampling approximation, we let $p(T) \propto q(t)$ be a probability distribution over \mathcal{T}_{k_0} with *sampling weights* $q(t) \geq 0$ for $t \in [d] := \{0, \dots, d\}$. We then rewrite the SI as an expectation

$$I^m(S) := c_{k_0}(S) + \mathbb{E}_{T \sim p(T)} \left[\nu_0(T) \frac{\gamma^m(t, |T \cap S|)}{p(T)} \right].$$

The SHAP-IQ estimator is defined as the Monte-Carlo estimate given sampled subsets from p .

Definition 3.2 (SHAP-IQ). Given $T_1, \dots, T_K \stackrel{iid}{\sim} p(T)$, the *Shapley Interaction Quantification (SHAP-IQ)* of order k_0 is defined as

$$\hat{I}_{k_0}^m(S) := c_{k_0}(S) + \frac{1}{K} \cdot \sum_{k=1}^K \nu_0(T_k) \frac{\gamma^m(t_k, |T_k \cap S|)}{p(T_k)}.$$

The SHAP-IQ estimator is computed by finding the sampling order k_0 , sample subsets $T \sim p(T)$ and updating *all* interaction estimates. The procedure is outlined in Algorithm 1. The simple structure of SHAP-IQ allows to establish important theoretical guarantees.

Theorem 3.3. *SHAP-IQ is unbiased and consistent, i.e. $\mathbb{E} \left[\hat{I}_{k_0}^m(S) \right] = I^m(S)$ and $\lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \hat{I}_{k_0}^m(S) = I^m(S)$.*

We further provide an approximation bound that depends on the variance $\sigma^2(S) := \mathbb{V} \left[\nu_0(T) \frac{\gamma^m(|T|, |T \cap S|)}{p(T)} \right]$.

Theorem 3.4 (Approximation Bound). *For SHAP-IQ and $\epsilon > 0$, it holds $\mathbb{P}(|\hat{I}_{k_0}^m(S) - I^m(S)| > \epsilon) \leq \frac{1}{K} \frac{\sigma^2(S)}{\epsilon^2}$.*

SHAP-IQ provides efficient estimates of all SI scores with important theoretical guarantees. The sample variance s^2 can be used for further statistical analysis.

Parameters of SHAP-IQ. In line with U-KSH, we find the sampling order k_0 using the sampling weights $q(t)$ and a probability distribution $p(T) \propto q(t)$ for $t = 0, \dots, d$. The sampling order k_0 is the highest number, such that for all subsets of size $t < k_0$ and $t > d - k_0$ the expected number of subsets exceeds the total number of subsets. To sample from $p(T) \propto q(t)$, we choose a subset size $t \in \{k_0, \dots, d - k_0\}$ with probability $p(|T| = t) \propto q(t) \binom{d}{t}$ and then sample uniformly with probability $1/\binom{d}{t}$ from subsets of size t . The procedures are outlined in Appendix C.1.

Algorithm 1 SHAP-IQ for interactions \mathcal{S} of order s_0

Require: Budget $K > 0$, weights $q(t) \geq 0$ with $t \in [d]$, precomputed weights $\gamma^m(t, \ell)$ for $t \in [d]$ and $\ell \in [s_0]$

```

1:  $k_0 \leftarrow \text{GETSAMPLINGORDER}(q, K)$ 
2: for  $T \notin \mathcal{T}_{k_0}$  do ▷ Deterministic
3:    $\eta \leftarrow \nu_0(T)$ 
4:   for  $S \in \mathcal{S}$  do
5:      $c_{k_0}(S) \leftarrow c_{k_0}(S) + \eta \cdot \gamma^m(t, |T \cap S|)$ 
6:   end for
7:    $K \leftarrow K - 1$ 
8: end for
9: for  $t = k_0, \dots, d - k_0$  do
10:   $p(t) \leftarrow q(t) / \left( \sum_{k=k_0}^{d-k_0} q(k) \binom{d}{k} \right)$ 
11: end for
12: for  $k = 1, \dots, K$  do ▷ Sampling
13:   $T \leftarrow \text{SAMPLE}(p, k_0)$ 
14:   $\eta \leftarrow \nu_0(T)$ 
15:  for  $S \in \mathcal{S}$  do
16:     $\Delta(S) \leftarrow \eta \cdot \gamma^m(t, |T \cap S|) / p[t]$ 
17:  end for
18:   $\hat{\mu}^m, s_2 \leftarrow \text{WELFORDUPDATE}(\hat{\mu}^m, s_2, k, \Delta)$ 
19: end for
20:  $\text{mean } \hat{I}_{k_0}^m \leftarrow c_{k_0} + \hat{\mu}^m$  and  $\text{variance } \hat{s}^2 \leftarrow s_2 / (n - 1)$ 
21: return  $\hat{I}_{k_0}^m$  and  $\hat{s}^2$ 

```

Computational Complexity. In contrast to permutation-based approximations, SHAP-IQ allows to iteratively update *all* interaction estimates with *one single* model evaluation for any-order interactions. The weights $\gamma^m(t, k)$ used for the updates can be efficiently precomputed. The updating process can be implemented efficiently using Welford’s algorithm (Welford, 1962), where estimates have to be maintained for all interactions sets, i.e. $\binom{d}{s}$ in total, see Appendix C.2. In contrast to KB approximation, which requires to solve a weighted least square optimization problem with number of variables equal to the number of interaction sets, the computational effort per interaction increases linearly for SHAP-IQ. Furthermore, SHAP-IQ even allows to update selected interaction estimates, whereas, for instance, KB approximation for FSI requires to estimate *all* interactions at once.

3.2. SHAP-IQ for the Shapley Value

We now analyze SHAP-IQ for the special case of SV. We show that Theorem 3.1 yields a novel representation of the SV and that SHAP-IQ directly corresponds to the U-KSH estimator, if the sampling distribution is chosen as $p(T) \propto \mu_{Sh}(t)$. Our results greatly simplify the calculation of U-KSH and further show that SHAP-IQ for SV maintains the efficiency property throughout the sampling process. All proofs in this section can be found in Appendix D.2.

We consider the SI estimator with the SV weights $m(t) := \frac{(d-t-1)!t!}{d!}$, which corresponds to SII, STI and FSI with maximum interaction order $s_0 = 1$. Theorem 3.1 then yields a novel representation of the SV.

Theorem 3.5 (SV). *With $c_1(i) = \nu_0(D)/d$, it holds*

$$\phi(i) = c_1(i) + \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_1} \nu_0(T) \mu_{Sh}(t) \left[\mathbf{1}(i \in T) - \frac{t}{d} \right].$$

The SHAP-IQ estimator for SV admits a similar form.

Proposition 3.6 (SHAP-IQ for SV). *For SHAP-IQ with $p(T) \propto \mu_{Sh}(t)$ and sampling order $k_0 = 1$, it holds*

$$\hat{I}_1^m(i) = c_1(i) + \frac{2h_{d-1}}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \nu_0(T_k) \left[\mathbf{1}(i \in T_k) - \frac{t_k}{d} \right],$$

where $h_n := \sum_{t=1}^n t^{-1}$ is the harmonic number.

Further, SHAP-IQ for SV corresponds to U-KSH $\hat{\phi}_U$.

Theorem 3.7 (U-KSH). *SHAP-IQ with $p(T) := \mu_{Sh}(t)/(2h_{d-1}) \propto \mu_{Sh}(t)$ and sampling order $k_0 = 1$ is U-KSH, i.e. $\hat{I}_1^m(i) = \hat{\phi}_U(i)$.*

Theorem 3.7 implies that the U-KSH estimator can be computed using the SHAP-IQ estimator, which greatly simplifies the calculation to a weighted sum. The main idea of the proof relies on the observation that not only A can be explicitly computed, but also A^{-1} .

3.3. Efficiency for SII

Notably for the SV, the efficiency condition is fully determined by $c_1(i)$, as by Theorem 3.5 $\sum_{i \in D} \phi(i) = \sum_{i \in D} c_1(i)$. By Proposition 3.6, this also holds for the estimates of SHAP-IQ, i.e. $\sum_{i \in D} \hat{I}_1^m(i) = \sum_{i \in D} c_1(i)$. We generalize this property for higher order interactions, i.e. interactions of size $s > 1$ in the term *s-efficiency* to find an efficiency property of SII.

Definition 3.8 (s-Efficiency). A SI index with maximum interaction order s_0 and weights m is *s-efficient*, if

$$\sum_{\substack{S \subset D \\ |S|=s_0}} I^m(S) = \sum_{\substack{S \subset D \\ |S|=s_0}} \hat{I}_{s_0}^m(S) = \sum_{\substack{S \subset D \\ |S|=s_0}} c_{s_0}(S).$$

As for the SV, *s-efficiency* ensures that the sum of all estimated interaction values of SHAP-IQ is constant for every choice of sampled subsets. However, for higher order SI estimates the sum of interaction values does not necessarily yield the SV efficiency $\nu_0(D)$. We now show that SII and STI are *s-efficient*³. All proofs can be found in Appendix D.3.

³Although we did not provide a rigorous statement, it is easy to validate numerically that FSI in general is not *s-efficient*.

Theorem 3.9. *SII and STI are s-efficient and the sum of all SHAP-IQ estimates remains constant, if $k_0 \geq s_0$.*

Using s-efficiency, it is easy to calculate an efficiency property of SII, which is maintained by the SHAP-IQ estimator.

Proposition 3.10 (SII Efficiency). *For SII it holds*

$$\sum_{\substack{S \subset D \\ |S|=s_0}} I^{m_{\text{SII}}}(S) = \sum_{\substack{T \subset D \\ t < s_0}} r(t) [(-1)^{s_0} \nu(T) + \nu(D \setminus T)],$$

where $r(t) := \frac{1}{s_0} \binom{d-t}{s_0-t-1}$ and $m_{\text{SII}}(t) := \frac{(d-t-s_0)t!}{(d-s_0+1)!}$.

The SII efficiency yields a novel quantity, whose analysis we leave to future research.

4. Experiments

We conduct multiple experiments to illustrate the approximation quality of SHAP-IQ compared to current baseline approaches.⁴ We showcase SHAP-IQ on a complex language model, on synthetic models and for the special case of SVs, where it corresponds to U-KSH.

For each interaction index, we use its unique approximation method as a baseline. For SII and STI, we use the PB estimator \hat{I}_{PB}^m described in Appendix E.1.1. For FSI, we use \hat{I}_{KB}^m with the sampling methodology from KSH, i.e. $p(T) \propto \mu_{\text{Sh}}(t)$, see Appendix E.1.2. In the following, we refer to the baseline methods as SII, STI and FSI. We compare the baseline methods with SHAP-IQ using the same sampling approach, i.e. $p(T) \propto \mu_{\text{Sh}}(t)$. For each iteration we evaluate the approximation quality with different budgets up to a maximum budget of 2^{14} model evaluations. To quantify the approximation quality, we compute multiple evaluation metrics for the top-order interactions \mathcal{S} , i.e. $|S| = s_0$: mean-squared error (MSE) as $\sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} (\hat{I}^m(S) - I^m(S))^2 / \binom{d}{s_0}$ for all $S \in \mathcal{S}$, MSE for the top-K interactions (MSE@K) and the ratio (precision) of estimated top-K interactions (P@K).

4.1. SHAP-IQ on Synthetic Models

In practice, computing ground-truth values for the SV and the SI is computationally prohibitive. In this section, we conduct experiments with a well-known class of synthetic models for which we can explicitly compute ground-truth values. For subsets $Q_1, \dots, Q_N \subset D$ and $a_1, \dots, a_N \in \mathbb{R}$ we define the *sum of unanimity model* (SOU) as $\nu(T) := \sum_{n=1}^N a_n \mathbf{1}(Q_n \subset T)$, also known as *sum of unanimity game*. Due to the linearity of SI, we can compute the exact ground-truth values for a SOU efficiently, see Appendix E.2. For our experiments, we

consider SOUMs of different complexity by choosing a maximum interaction size ℓ_{max} . We use $d = 30$ features with $N = 100$ interactions and draw them by uniformly choosing a subset size $t \in [\ell_{\text{max}}]$ and then uniformly choosing an interaction of size t . For each interaction, we generate the coefficients uniformly with $a_n \sim \text{unif}([0, 1])$. We conduct experiments on four different scenarios by choosing $\ell_{\text{max}} = 10, 15, 20, 30$. For each scenario, we compute 50 iterations of different models and compute the average and standard deviation of each evaluation metric for SHAP-IQ and the baseline methods for pairwise interactions ($s_0 = 2$) of each index. Our results are shown in Figure 2 and further experiments and results can be found in Appendix E.4.

Results. For sparse SOUM, i.e. with low $\ell_{\text{max}} = 10$, we observe that the baseline methods outperform SHAP-IQ. With increasing complexity ($\ell_{\text{max}} = 15$) SHAP-IQ performance improves and is similar to the baseline methods. From $\ell_{\text{max}} = 20$, SHAP-IQ outperforms all baseline methods. We conclude that SHAP-IQ is preferable in dense SOUM, whereas the baseline methods are preferable in sparse SOUM. As expected, we observe that for sparse SOUM the variance of the estimates is high, which yields an interesting starting point for improvements of SHAP-IQ. While ground-truth values for SOUMs can be explicitly computed for high-dimensional scenarios, they are very limited in their significance for real-world applications.

4.2. SHAP-IQ on a Language Model (LM)

In this experiment, we apply SHAP-IQ on a state-of-the-art LM in a real-world setting. We use a fine-tuned version of the DistilBERT transformer architecture (Sanh et al., 2019) on movie review sentences from the original *IMDB* dataset (Maas et al., 2011) for sentiment analysis, i.e. ν has values in $[-1, 1]$. In the LM, different feature coalitions are computed by masking absent features in a tokenized sentence. The implementation is based on the *transformers* API (Wolf et al., 2020) and the data is collected from *datasets* (Lhoest et al., 2021). We randomly sample 50 reviews of length $d = 14$ and compute pairwise interactions, i.e. $s_0 = 2$. We compare the results of each interaction index with the baseline method by computing the ground-truth values explicitly using Theorem 3.1. Our results are shown in Figure 1 and further experiments and results can be found in Appendix E.3.

Results. For the LM, SHAP-IQ clearly outperforms the baseline for SII and STI. For FSI, SHAP-IQ performs slightly worse when measured with MSE and equally well on MSE@10. Similarly when evaluated with P@10, SHAP-IQ outperforms the baselines for SII and STI, and performs equally well with FSI. As SII and STI rely on PA, our results indicate that KB approximation is more effective than

⁴Implementation can be found at <https://github.com/FFmg11/shapiq>.




Figure 1. MSE (first and second), MSE@10 (third) and P@10 (fourth) of SHAP-IQ and baseline methods per model evaluation for SII, STI and FSI for pairwise interactions. We use a LM with sentences of length 14 averaged over 50 iterations.




Figure 2. MSE of SHAP-IQ and baseline methods per model evaluations for SII, STI and FSI and pairwise interactions. We use SOUM with 30 features, $N = 100$ generated interactions with $\ell_{\max} = 10, 15, 20, 25$ using 50 iterations of randomly generated SOUMs.

PB for this setting. We conclude that SII and STI could benefit from a KB approach, but otherwise the theoretically well-understood SHAP-IQ estimator should be used.

4.3. SHAP-IQ for the Shapley value

We apply SHAP-IQ to approximate the SV, i.e. interactions of order $s_0 = 1$. We have shown in Theorem 3.7 that in this case SHAP-IQ corresponds to U-KSH Covert & Lee (2021) with a greatly simplified representation. We consider a gradient boosting tree on the *adult* dataset (Kohavi, 1996) and compute SHAP-IQ with 50 iterations. We further compute the SV for the LM setting. The results are shown in Figure 4.3.

Results. SHAP-IQ outperforms KernelSHAP and PB sampling for lower budgets and KernelSHAP overtakes SHAP-IQ, if the budget reaches the maximum (2^d).

5. Conclusion

How to extend the SV to interactions is an open research question. We introduced a general definition of Shapley interactions (SI), which covers all currently proposed indices, as well as all indices that fulfill the linearity, symmetry and dummy axiom. We established a novel representation of SI, which we used to introduce SHAP-IQ, an efficient sampling-based approximation algorithm for SI with the-




Figure 3. MSE of SHAP-IQ and baseline methods for the SV for $g = 50$ LM and GBT predictions.

oretical guarantees. For the special case of SV, SHAP-IQ corresponds to U-KSH (Covert & Lee, 2021) and greatly simplifies its calculation as well as providing a novel representation of the SV. Our experiment show that SHAP-IQ outperforms the baseline approaches for SII and STI and yields comparable results on FSI in applied settings. The FSI baseline uses a KB approach, which outperforms SHAP-IQ in some scenarios but is theoretically not well understood. It remains an interesting open question, if a KB approach can be found for our general SI definition. Our results have shown that SHAP-IQ performs worse when we observe high variance of the sampling estimates. It remains an open question, if these observations and our statistical guarantees can be used to improve the sampling methodology of SHAP-IQ.

We have shown that estimates of SHAP-IQ for SII and STI maintain an efficiency condition, whose analysis may be interesting to quantify the amount of interaction.

Acknowledgements

We gratefully acknowledge funding by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation): TRR 318/1 2021 – 438445824. Patrick Kolpaczki is supported by the research training group Datatinja (Trustworthy AI for Seamless Problem Solving: Next Generation Intelligence Joins Robust Data Analysis) funded by the German federal state of North Rhine-Westphalia.

References

- Adadi, A. and Berrada, M. Peeking inside the black-box: A survey on explainable artificial intelligence (XAI). *IEEE Access*, 6:52138–52160, 2018. doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2018.2870052.
- Castro, J., Gómez, D., and Tejada, J. Polynomial calculation of the shapley value based on sampling. *Comput. Oper. Res.*, 36(5):1726–1730, 2009. doi: 10.1016/j.cor.2008.04.004.
- Castro, J., Gómez, D., Molina, E., and Tejada, J. Improving polynomial estimation of the shapley value by stratified random sampling with optimum allocation. *Comput. Oper. Res.*, 82:180–188, 2017. doi: 10.1016/j.cor.2017.01.019.
- Charnes, A., Golany, B., Keane, M., and Rousseau, J. *Extremal Principle Solutions of Games in Characteristic Function Form: Core, Chebychev and Shapley Value Generalizations*, volume 11 of *Advanced Studies in Theoretical and Applied Econometrics*, pp. 123–133. Springer Netherlands, 1988. doi: 10.1007/978-94-009-3677-5_7.
- Chen, H., Covert, I. C., Lundberg, S. M., and Lee, S. Algorithms to estimate shapley value feature attributions. *CoRR*, abs/2207.07605, 2022. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2207.07605.
- Covert, I. and Lee, S.-I. Improving kernelshap: Practical shapley value estimation using linear regression. In *Proceedings of The 24th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics (AISTATS 2021)*, volume 130 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 3457–3465. PMLR, 2021.
- Covert, I., Lundberg, S. M., and Lee, S. Explaining by removing: A unified framework for model explanation. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 22:209:1–209:90, 2021.
- Cui, T., Marttinen, P., and Kaski, S. Learning global pairwise interactions with bayesian neural networks. In *24th European Conference on Artificial Intelligence (PAIS 2020)*, volume 325 of *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence and Applications*, pp. 1087–1094. IOS Press, 2020. doi: 10.3233/FAIA200205.
- Ghorbani, A. and Zou, J. Y. Data shapley: Equitable valuation of data for machine learning. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning, (ICML 2019)*, volume 97 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 2242–2251. PMLR, 2019.
- Grabisch, M. and Roubens, M. An axiomatic approach to the concept of interaction among players in cooperative games. *Int. J. Game Theory*, 28(4):547–565, 1999. doi: 10.1007/s001820050125.
- Grabisch, M., Marichal, J., and Roubens, M. Equivalent representations of set functions. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 25(2): 157–178, 2000. doi: 10.1287/moor.25.2.157.12225.
- Hammer, P. L. and Holzman, R. Approximations of pseudo-boolean functions; applications to game theory. *ZOR Methods Model. Oper. Res.*, 36(1):3–21, 1992. doi: 10.1007/BF01541028.
- Janizek, J. D., Sturmfels, P., and Lee, S. Explaining explanations: Axiomatic feature interactions for deep networks. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 22:104:1–104:54, 2021.
- Jia, R., Dao, D., Wang, B., Hubis, F. A., Hynes, N., Gürel, N. M., Li, B., Zhang, C., Song, D., and Spanos, C. J. Towards efficient data valuation based on the shapley value. In *The 22nd International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics, (AISTATS 2019)*, volume 89 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 1167–1176. PMLR, 2019.
- Kohavi, R. Scaling up the accuracy of naive-bayes classifiers: A decision-tree hybrid. In *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining (KDD-96)*, pp. 202–207. AAAI Press, 1996.
- Lhoest, Q., Villanova del Moral, A., von Platen, P., Wolf, T., Šaško, M., Jernite, Y., Thakur, A., Tunstall, L., Patil, S., Drame, M., Chaumond, J., Plu, J., Davison, J., Brandeis, S., Sanh, V., Le Scao, T., Canwen Xu, K., Patry, N., Liu, S., McMillan-Major, A., Schmid, P., Gugger, S., Raw, N., Lesage, S., Lozhkov, A., Carrigan, M., Matusevicius, T., von Werra, L., Debut, L., Bekman, S., and Delangue, C. Datasets: A Community Library for Natural Language Processing. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pp. 175–184. Association for Computational Linguistics, 11 2021.
- Lou, Y., Caruana, R., Gehrke, J., and Hooker, G. Accurate intelligible models with pairwise interactions. In *The 19th*

- ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, (KDD 2013), pp. 623–631. ACM, 2013. doi: 10.1145/2487575.2487579.
- Lundberg, S. M. and Lee, S. A unified approach to interpreting model predictions. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2017 (NeurIPS 2017)*, pp. 4765–4774, 2017.
- Lundberg, S. M., Erion, G. G., Chen, H., DeGrave, A. J., Prutkin, J. M., Nair, B., Katz, R., Himmelfarb, J., Bansal, N., and Lee, S. From local explanations to global understanding with explainable AI for trees. *Nat. Mach. Intell.*, 2(1):56–67, 2020. doi: 10.1038/s42256-019-0138-9.
- Maas, A. L., Daly, R. E., Pham, P. T., Huang, D., Ng, A. Y., and Potts, C. Learning word vectors for sentiment analysis. In *Proceedings of the 49th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pp. 142–150. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2011.
- Maleki, S., Tran-Thanh, L., Hines, G., Rahwan, T., and Rogers, A. Bounding the estimation error of sampling-based shapley value approximation with/without stratifying. *CoRR*, abs/1306.4265, 2013.
- Molnar, C., Casalicchio, G., and Bischl, B. Quantifying model complexity via functional decomposition for better post-hoc interpretability. In *Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases - International Workshops of ECML PKDD 2019*, pp. 193–204, 2019. doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-43823-4_17.
- Murdoch, W. J., Liu, P. J., and Yu, B. Beyond word importance: Contextual decomposition to extract interactions from lstms. In *6th International Conference on Learning Representations, (ICLR 2018)*, 2018.
- Ruiz, L. M., Valenciano, F., and Zarzuelo, J. M. The least square prenucleolus and the least square nucleolus. two values for tu games based on the excess vector. *International Journal of Game Theory*, 25(1):113–134, Mar 1996. ISSN 1432-1270. doi: 10.1007/BF01254388.
- Ruiz, L. M., Valenciano, F., and Zarzuelo, J. M. The family of least square values for transferable utility games. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 24(1):109–130, 1998. ISSN 0899-8256. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1006/game.1997.0622>.
- Sanh, V., Debut, L., Chaumond, J., and Wolf, T. Distilbert, a distilled version of BERT: smaller, faster, cheaper and lighter. *CoRR*, abs/1910.01108, 2019.
- Shapley, L. S. A Value for n-Person Games. In *Contributions to the Theory of Games (AM-28), Volume II*, pp. 307–318. Princeton University Press, 1953.
- Singh, C., Murdoch, W. J., and Yu, B. Hierarchical interpretations for neural network predictions. In *7th International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR 2019)*, 2019.
- Spivey, M. Z. Combinatorial sums and finite differences. *Discret. Math.*, 307(24):3130–3146, 2007. doi: 10.1016/j.disc.2007.03.052.
- Sundararajan, M., Dhamdhere, K., and Agarwal, A. The shapley taylor interaction index. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning, (ICML 2020)*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 9259–9268. PMLR, 2020.
- Tsai, C., Yeh, C., and Ravikumar, P. Faith-shap: The faithful shapley interaction index. *CoRR*, abs/2203.00870, 2022. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2203.00870.
- Tsang, M., Cheng, D., and Liu, Y. Detecting statistical interactions from neural network weights. In *6th International Conference on Learning Representations, (ICLR 2018)*, 2018.
- Tsang, M., Cheng, D., Liu, H., Feng, X., Zhou, E., and Liu, Y. Feature interaction interpretability: A case for explaining ad-recommendation systems via neural interaction detection. In *8th International Conference on Learning Representations, (ICLR 2020)*, 2020a.
- Tsang, M., Rambhatla, S., and Liu, Y. How does this interaction affect me? interpretable attribution for feature interactions. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 31: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS 2020)*, pp. 6147–6159, 2020b.
- Welford, B. P. Note on a method for calculating corrected sums of squares and products. *Technometrics*, 4(3): 419–420, 1962. doi: 10.1080/00401706.1962.10490022.
- Williamson, B. D. and Feng, J. Efficient nonparametric statistical inference on population feature importance using shapley values. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning, (ICML 2020)*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 10282–10291. PMLR, 2020.
- Wolf, T., Debut, L., Sanh, V., Chaumond, J., Delangue, C., Moi, A., Cistac, P., Ma, C., Jernite, Y., Plu, J., Xu, C., Le Scao, T., Gugger, S., Drame, M., Lhoest, Q., and Rush, A. M. Transformers: State-of-the-Art Natural Language Processing. pp. 38–45. Association for Computational Linguistics, 10 2020.
- Yeh, C., Kim, J. S., Yen, I. E., and Ravikumar, P. Representor point selection for explaining deep neural networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 31:*

*Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing
Systems (NeurIPS 2018)*, pp. 9311–9321, 2018.

A. Shapley Interaction Axioms

We consider \mathcal{G} as the set of all games $\nu : \mathcal{P}(D) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. In the following, we formalize the axioms for the Shapley interaction indices $I_\nu : \mathcal{P}(D) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

Definition A.1 (Linearity Axiom). I_ν is *linear*, if for any two games $\nu_1, \nu_2 \in \mathcal{G}$ and any $S \subset D$, it holds $I_{\nu_1 + \nu_2}(S) = I_{\nu_1}(S) + I_{\nu_2}(S)$.

Definition A.2 (Dummy Axiom). For a dummy player $i \in D$ for a game $\nu \in \mathcal{G}$, i.e. constant contribution $c(i)$ added to any coalition $\nu(T \cup \{i\}) = \nu(T) + c(i)$, then for every $T \subset D \setminus \{i\}$, the *dummy axiom* requires $I_\nu(S \cup \{i\}) = 0$ for any $S \subset D \setminus \{i\}$. That is, a dummy player has no interaction with any coalition.

Definition A.3 (Symmetry Axiom). I_ν is said to fulfill the *symmetry axiom*, if for any permutation π on D it holds $I_\nu(S) = I_{\pi\nu}(\pi S)$, where $\pi\nu(\pi S) := \nu(S)$ and $\pi S := \{\pi(i) : i \in S\}$ changes the ordering of the players.

Definition A.4 (Recursive Axiom). I_ν fulfills the *recursive axiom*, if for any $S \subset D$ with $|S| > 1$ and any game $\nu \in \mathcal{G}$

$$I_\nu(S) = I_{\nu_{[S]}}([S]) - \sum_{K \subsetneq S, K \neq \emptyset} I_{\nu^{D \setminus K}}(S \setminus K),$$

where $\nu_{[S]}$ is the game, where all players in S is considered as one player, and $\nu^{D \setminus K}$ is a game defined on the subset of players $D \setminus K$.

The recursive axiom defines higher order interactions using lower order interaction. For pairwise interactions it can be stated as $I_\nu(ij) = I_{\nu_{[ij]}}([ij]) - I_{\nu^{D \setminus \{i\}}}(j) - I_{\nu^{D \setminus \{j\}}}(i)$, i.e. the pairwise interaction is the difference of the value for the reduced player $[ij]$ and the individual player values for the reduced game.

Definition A.5 (Shapley Interaction Index). The Shapley interaction index (SII) is the unique interaction index that satisfies the linearity, dummy, symmetry and recursive axiom, where the values for $|S| = 1$ correspond to the Shapley value.

In contrast to the SV, the SII does not yield an efficiency property, which is desirable in ML context. The efficiency axiom was therefore introduced for interactions. The following axioms rely on a maximum interaction order s_0 , where the values of the interaction indices change for different maximum interaction orders.

Definition A.6 (Efficiency Axiom). For all $\nu \in \mathcal{G}$, it holds $\sum_{S \subset D, s \leq s_0} I_\nu(S) = \nu(D) - \nu(\emptyset)$.

The efficiency axiom is an extension of the SV efficiency axiom and requires that all interaction scores up to the maximum order s_0 sum up to $\nu(D) - \nu(\emptyset)$. However, unlike for the SV, it is not sufficient to require efficiency for a unique interaction index.

Definition A.7 (Interaction Distribution Axiom). For an *interaction function* ν_T parametrized by $T \subset D$ it holds $\nu_T(S) = 0$, if $T \subsetneq S$ and a constant value $\nu_T(S) = c$ for $T \subset S$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$. The *interaction distribution axiom* requires for all $S \subset D$ with $S \subsetneq T$ and $s < s_0$ that $I_{\nu_T}(S) = 0$.

Definition A.8 (The Shapley-Taylor Interaction Index). The Shapley-Taylor interaction index (STI) is the unique interaction index that satisfies the linearity, dummy, symmetry, efficiency and interaction distribution axiom.

The STI yields a unique interaction index by introducing the interaction distribution axiom. However, it was argued that instead the representation of the interaction index as a solution to a weighted least square problem is preferable (Tsai et al., 2022).

Definition A.9 (Faith-Interaction Index). I_ν is called a *Faith-interaction index* if it can be expressed as

$$I_\nu = \arg \min_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{s_0}}} \sum_{T \subset D: \mu(T) < \infty} \mu(T) \left(\nu(T) - \sum_{\substack{T \subset S \\ t \leq s_0}} \beta(S) \right)^2 \quad (2)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \nu(T) = \sum_{S \subset T, t \leq s_0} \beta(S), \forall T : \mu(T) = \infty.$$

Definition A.10 (Faithful-Shapley Interaction Index). The faithful-Shapley interaction index (FSI) is the unique faith-interaction index that satisfies the linearity, dummy, symmetry and efficiency axiom.

It was shown in (Grabisch & Roubens, 1999) that every interaction index satisfying the linearity, symmetry and dummy axiom admits a SI representation.

Proposition A.11. *Every interaction index satisfying the linearity, symmetry and dummy axiom can be represented as*

$$I^{m_{s_0}}(S) := \sum_{T \subset D \setminus S} m_{s_0}(t) \delta_S^\nu(T).$$

Furthermore, the weights m_{s_0} for the top-order interaction indices, i.e. $s = s_0$ are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} m_{SII}(t) &:= m_{s_0}(t) := \frac{(d-t-s_0)!t!}{(d-s_0+1)!}, \\ m_{STI}(t) &:= m_{s_0}(t) := s_0 \frac{(d-t-1)!t!}{d!}, \\ m_{FSI}(t) &:= m_{s_0}(t) := \frac{(2s_0-1)!}{((s_0-1)!)^2} \frac{(d-t-1)!(t+s_0-1)!}{(d+s_0-1)!}. \end{aligned}$$

The definitions for lower order interactions can be found in (Grabisch & Roubens, 1999) for SII, in (Sundararajan et al., 2020) for STI and in (Tsai et al., 2022) for FSI.

Proof. For the proofs, we refer to the corresponding paper of each index. The general statement is proven in Proposition 5. in (Grabisch & Roubens, 1999). \square

B. Approximation Methods for the SV

There are two prominent representations of the SV, which are used for sampling-based approximation. Both allow to update all SVs simultaneously with one sample as well as maintaining the efficiency property.

B.1. Permutation-based (PB) Approximation

Permutation-based (PB) approximation was introduced for SV (Castro et al., 2009). It is based on the observation that the marginal contributions $\delta_i^\nu(T) = \nu(T \cup \{i\}) - \nu(T)$ can be computed by using permutations $\pi \in \mathfrak{S}_D$ of D and $\nu(u_i^-(\pi)) - \nu(u_i^+(\pi))$, where $u_i^-(\pi), u_i^+(\pi)$ are the sets that consist of all elements preceding i in π with and without i , respectively. For for each subset $T \subset D \setminus \{i\}$ of size t there are exactly $t!(d-t-1)!$ permutations with $T = u_i^-(\pi)$ and thus

$$\phi(i) = \frac{1}{d!} \sum_{\pi \in \mathfrak{S}_D} \delta_i^\nu(u_i^-(\pi)) = \mathbb{E}_{\pi \sim \text{unif}(\mathfrak{S}_D)}[\delta_i^\nu(u_i^-(\pi))].$$

This expectation can be efficiently approximated by sampling $\pi \sim \text{unif}(\mathfrak{S}_D)$ and using a Monte-Carlo estimate for the expectation. As $\sum_{i \in D} \delta_i^\nu(u_i^-(\pi)) = \nu(D) - \nu(\emptyset)$ for arbitrary permutations π , the efficiency constraint is maintained throughout the sampling procedure. The Monte-Carlo estimates allows to apply well-established statistical results to obtain bounds on the approximation error (Maleki et al., 2013; Castro et al., 2017).

B.2. Kernel-based (KB) Approximation

Kernel Shapley Additive Explanation Values (Lundberg & Lee, 2017), short KernelSHAP (KSH), and Unbiased KernelSHAP (U-KSH) (Covert & Lee, 2021) make use of the representation of the SV as the solution to a constrained quadratic optimization problem (Charnes et al., 1988)

$$\begin{aligned} \phi &= \arg \min_{\beta} \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_1} \mu_{Sh}(t) \left(\nu_0(T) - \sum_{i \in T} \beta_i \right)^2 \\ \text{s.t. } &\sum_{i \in D} \beta_i = \nu_0(D) \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

with $\nu_0(T) := \nu(T) - \nu(\emptyset)$, $\mathcal{T}_k := \{T \subset D : k \leq t \leq d - k\}$ and $\mu_{Sh}(t) := \frac{1}{d-1} \binom{d-2}{t-1}^{-1}$. This quadratic optimization problem can be solved explicitly using the weighted least square solution

$$\phi = (\mathbf{Z}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{Z})^{-1} \mathbf{Z}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{y}, \quad (4)$$

where $\mathbf{Z} \in \{0, 1\}^{2^d \times d}$ is a row-wise binary encoding of all subsets of $T \subset D$, $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{2^d \times 2^d}$ is a diagonal matrix with the subset weights μ_{Sh} and \mathbf{y} consists of the evaluations of $\nu_0(T)$ for each subset. To include the optimization constraint, the (otherwise undefined) weights $\mu_{Sh}(d), \mu_{Sh}(0)$ of D and \emptyset are set to a high positive constant. Solving (4) still requires 2^d model evaluations and thus KSH (Lundberg & Lee, 2017) approximates ϕ by solving (4) for a collection of subsets. The KSH estimator is difficult to analyze and it is only known that it is asymptotically unbiased (Williamson & Feng, 2020).

KSH constructs a collection of subsets by determining a *sampling order* k_0 , such that subsets with $k_0 \leq t \leq d - k_0$ are sampled from $p(T) \propto \mu_{Sh}(t)$ and for $t < k_0$ or $t > d - k_0$ all possible subsets are used. The value of k_0 is thereby found by successively comparing the expected number of subsets with the total number of subsets of that size. As the number of subsets $\binom{d}{t}$ grows towards the middle, and $\binom{d}{t} = \binom{d}{d-t}$ the implementation starts the comparison from the edges and iteratively increases the k_0 candidate. For more details and pseudo code, we refer to Appendix C.1.

C. Algorithmic Details

C.1. Subset sampling

Both U-KSH and KSH sample subsets with $p(T) \propto \mu_{Sh}(t)$. Given a computational budget of M model evaluations, the subset sizes $t = 1, \dots, d - 1$ are split into a deterministic part and a sampling part. For the deterministic part, all subsets of the particular sizes are evaluated (each subset is drawn only once), while for the sampling part, subsets are drawn according to the sampling distribution p (sampling with replacement). The deterministic part is calculated first for the subset sizes where the expected number of subsets, $M \cdot p(|T| = t)$, with $p(|T| = t) \propto \mu_{Sh}(t) \binom{d}{t}$ exceeds the total number of all combinations $\binom{d}{t}$. The subset sizes are thereby only considered for the deterministic part, if both sizes t and $d - t$ exceed the expected number of subsets. Note that this is always the case as $\mu_{Sh}(t)$ is symmetric. The deterministic subset sizes are collected, by starting from the edges, i.e. $k_0 = 0$ and successively increasing k_0 until the expected number of subsets does not exceed the number of subsets for that size. The algorithm to find k_0 given weight q and budget K is outlined in Algorithm C.1. The computation budget is then reduced by the number of subsets within the deterministic subset sizes. For all remaining subset sizes (a newly scaled) $p(|T| = t) \propto \mu_{Sh}(t) \binom{d}{t}$ is used to sample subset sizes to draw subsets from. Within each size t , the subsets are drawn uniformly with probability $1/\binom{d}{t}$, which results in $p(T) \propto \mu_{Sh}(t)$. The sampling procedure to generate a subset according to $p(T)$ is outlined in Algorithm C.1.

It was shown empirically (and theoretically for U-KSH and specific games) that the approximation quality benefits from sampling subsets pairwise by always including the complement Z^c for every drawn subset Z (Covert & Lee, 2021).

Algorithm 2 Determine the the sampling order k_0 for the deterministic part

Require: weights q over $[d]$, budget $K > 0$

```

1: for  $t = 0, \dots, \text{FLOOR}(d/2)$  do
2:    $R = \left( \sum_{k=k_0}^{d-k_0} q[k] \binom{d}{k} \right)$ 
3:    $p[t] \leftarrow q[t] \binom{d}{t} / R$ 
4:    $p[d-t] \leftarrow q[d-t] \binom{d}{t} / R$ 
5:   if  $K \cdot q[t] > R$  and  $K \cdot q[d-t] > R$  then
6:      $k_0 \leftarrow k_0 + 1$ 
7:      $K \leftarrow K - 2 \binom{d}{t}$ 
8:   end if
9: end for
10: return  $k_0$ 

```

▷ Normalization

Algorithm 3 Sample a subset $T \sim p(T)$

Require: p with $\sum_{k=k_0}^{d-k_0} p[k] = 1$, sampling order k_0

- 1: **for** $t = k_0, \dots, d - k_0$ **do**
 - 2: $p(|T| = t) \leftarrow p[t] \binom{d}{t}$
 - 3: **end for**
 - 4: choose subset size t_0 with probability $p(|T| = t)$
 - 5: choose subset T of size t_0 with probability $\binom{d}{t_0}^{-1}$
 - 6: **return** T
-

C.2. Welford's Algorithm

Welford's algorithm (Welford, 1962) allows to iteratively update the mean and variance using a single pass. The algorithm is outlined in Algorithm C.2.

Algorithm 4 Welford Algorithm for Mean and Variance (Welford, 1962)

Require: μ, s^2, n, Δ

- 1: $n \leftarrow n + 1$
 - 2: $\Delta_1 \leftarrow \Delta - \mu$
 - 3: $\mu \leftarrow \mu + \Delta/n$
 - 4: $\Delta_2 \leftarrow \Delta - \mu$
 - 5: $s^2 \leftarrow s^2 + \Delta_1 \Delta_2$
 - 6: **return** μ, s^2
-

D. Proofs

D.1. Proofs for SHAP-IQ

D.1.1. PROOF OF THEOREM 3.1

Proof. By definition, the sum $I^m(S) := \sum_{T \subset D \setminus S} m(t) \delta_S^m(T)$ ranges over all subsets $T \subset D$, where every subset is exactly once evaluated. On the one hand, it is easy to see that every evaluated subset in $I^m(S)$ is different, as $T \cup L$ is unique. Furthermore, given any subset $T \subset D$, we decompose $T = \hat{T} \cup L$, where $\hat{T} \subset D \setminus S$ and $L := T \cap S \subset S$. The corresponding weight is $m(\hat{t}) = m(t - l) = m(t - |T \cap S|)$ and the sign from $\delta_S^m(\hat{T})$ is $(-1)^{s-l} = (-1)^{s-|T \cap S|}$. This yields with $\nu_0(T) := \nu(T) - \nu(\emptyset)$

$$I^m(S) = \sum_{T \subset D} \nu(T) \gamma^m(t, |T \cap S|) = \sum_{T \subset D} \nu_0(T) \gamma^m(t, |T \cap S|) + \nu(\emptyset) \sum_{T \subset D} \gamma^m(t, |T \cap S|) = \sum_{T \subset D} \nu_0(T) \gamma^m(t, |T \cap S|),$$

as the sum over all γ^m is zero, if the dummy axiom is fulfilled.

Remark D.1. It is important to note, that the sum $\sum_{T \subset D} \gamma^m(t, |T \cap S|)$ is not zero, if not all subsets are considered, which makes it crucial to use ν_0 instead of ν . In fact, the estimates of I^m would be heavily skewed by $\nu(\emptyset)$. While the estimator would still be unbiased, its variance would scale with $\nu(\emptyset)^2$.

□

D.1.2. PROOF OF THEOREM 3.3

Proof. We aim to show that $\hat{I}^m(S)$ is unbiased and consistent, i.e. $\mathbb{E} \left[\hat{I}_{k_0}^m(S) \right] = I^m(S)$ and $\lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \hat{I}_{k_0}^m(S) = I^m(S)$. Given

$$\hat{I}_{k_0}^m(S) := c_{k_0}(S) + \frac{1}{K} \cdot \sum_{k=1}^K \nu_0(T_k) \frac{\gamma^m(t_k, |T_k \cap S|)}{p(T_k)},$$

it is clear that due to the linearity of the expectation

$$\mathbb{E}_{T \sim p(T)} \left[\hat{I}_{k_0}^m(S) \right] = c_{k_0}(S) + \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E}_{T \sim p(T)} \left[\nu_0(T) \frac{\gamma^m(|T|, |T \cap S|)}{p(T)} \right] = I^m(S).$$

Furthermore, let $\sigma^2(S) := \mathbb{V}_{T \sim p(T)} \left[\nu_0(T) \frac{\gamma^m(|T|, |T \cap S|)}{p(T)} \right]$ be the variance of each estimate, then, by the law of large numbers

$$\frac{1}{K} \cdot \sum_{k=1}^K \nu_0(T_k) \frac{\gamma^m(t_k, |T_k \cap S|)}{p(T_k)} \xrightarrow{K \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{T \sim p(T)} \left[\nu_0(T) \frac{\gamma^m(|T|, |T \cap S|)}{p(T)} \right],$$

and thus $\lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \hat{I}^m(S) = I^m(S)$. \square

D.1.3. PROOF OF THEOREM 3.4

Proof. Let $\sigma^2(S) := \mathbb{V}_{T \sim p(T)} \left[\nu_0(T) \frac{\gamma^m(|T|, |T \cap S|)}{p(T)} \right]$ be the variance of each estimate. By Theorem 3.3 $\hat{I}^m(S)$ is unbiased. Hence, we have for $\epsilon > 0$ by Chebyshev's inequality

$$\mathbb{P}(|\hat{I}_{k_0}^m(S) - I^m(S)| > \epsilon) \leq \frac{\mathbb{V}[\hat{I}_{k_0}^m(S)]}{\epsilon^2} = \frac{1}{K^2} \frac{K \sigma^2(S)}{\epsilon^2} = \frac{1}{K} \frac{\sigma^2(S)}{\epsilon^2}.$$

\square

D.2. Proofs for the SV

D.2.1. PROOF OF THEOREM 3.5

Proof. We let $m(t) := \frac{(d-t-1)!t!}{d!}$ and apply Theorem 3.1. With $\gamma^m(0, 0) = -m(0)$, $\gamma^m(d, 1) = m(d-1)$ and $m(0) = m(d-1) = \frac{1}{d}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(i) &\stackrel{\text{Theorem 3.1}}{=} \sum_{T \subset D} \nu(T) \gamma^m(t, \mathbf{1}(i \in T)) = \frac{\nu(D) - \nu(\emptyset)}{d} + \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_1} \nu(T) \gamma^m(t, \mathbf{1}(i \in T)) \\ &= c_1(i) + \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_1} \nu(T) [\mathbf{1}(i \in T) \gamma^m(t, 1) + \mathbf{1}(i \notin T) \gamma^m(t, 0)] \\ &= c_1(i) + \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_1} \nu(T) [\mathbf{1}(i \in T) (\gamma^m(t, 1) - \gamma^m(t, 0)) + \gamma^m(t, 0)] \\ &= c_1(i) + \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_1} \nu(T) [\mathbf{1}(i \in T) (m(t-1) + m(t)) - m(t)] \\ &= c_1(i) + \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_1} \nu(T) \left[\mathbf{1}(i \in T) \left(\frac{(d-t)!(t-1)!}{d!} + \frac{(d-t-1)!t!}{d!} \right) - \frac{(d-t-1)!t!}{d!} \right] \\ &= c_1(i) + \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_1} \nu(T) \frac{(d-t-1)!(t-1)!}{(d-1)!} \left[\mathbf{1}(i \in T) - \frac{t}{d} \right] \\ &= c_1(i) + \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_1} \nu(T) \mu_{Sh}(t) \left[\mathbf{1}(i \in T) - \frac{t}{d} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

\square

D.2.2. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3.6

Recall the definition of SHAP-IQ of order 1

$$\hat{I}_1^m(i) := c_1(i) + \frac{1}{K} \cdot \sum_{k=1}^K \nu(T_k) \frac{\gamma^m(t_k, |T_k \cap \{i\}|)}{p(T_k)}.$$

with $p(T_k) := \mu_{Sh}(t_k)/R \propto \mu_{Sh}(t_k)$. We proceed by rewriting $\gamma^m(t_k, |T_k \cap \{i\}|) = \gamma^m(t_k, \mathbf{1}(i \in T_k))$ for $T_k \in \mathcal{T}_1$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma^m(t_k, \mathbf{1}(i \in T_k)) &= (-1)^{1-\mathbf{1}(i \in T_k)} \frac{(d-t-1 + \mathbf{1}(i \in T_k))!(t - \mathbf{1}(i \in T_k))!}{d!} \\ &= \mu_{Sh}(t) \frac{1}{d} [\mathbf{1}(i \in T_k)(d-t_k) - \mathbf{1}(i \notin T_k)t_k] \\ &= \mu_{Sh}(t) \left[\mathbf{1}(i \in T_k) - \frac{t_k}{d} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\hat{I}_1^m(i) := c_1(i) + \frac{1}{K} \cdot \sum_{k=1}^K \nu(T_k) \frac{\mu_{Sh}(t) [\mathbf{1}(i \in T_k) - \frac{t_k}{d}]}{p(T_k)} = c_1(i) + \frac{R}{K} \cdot \sum_{k=1}^K \nu(T_k) \left[\mathbf{1}(i \in T_k) - \frac{t_k}{d} \right].$$

For the normalizing constant, we have

$$R = \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_1} \mu_{Sh}(t) = \sum_{t=1}^{d-1} \mu_{Sh}(t) \binom{d}{t} = \sum_{t=1}^{d-1} \frac{d}{t(d-t)} = \sum_{t=1}^{d-1} \left(\frac{1}{t} + \frac{1}{d-t} \right) = 2h_{d-1},$$

which finishes the proof.

D.2.3. PROOF OF THEOREM 3.7

Proof. According to Proposition 3.6, our goal is to show that

$$\hat{\phi}_U(i) = c_1(i) + \frac{2h_{d-1}}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \nu_0(T_k) \left[\mathbf{1}(i \in T_k) - \frac{t_k}{d} \right]$$

with $T_k \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} p(T) := \mu_{Sh}(t)/(2H_{d-1})$, where p is a probability distribution over \mathcal{T}_1 and $h_n := \sum_{t=1}^n t^{-1}$. The proof is structured in the following steps:

1. Exact computation of A^{-1} using the exact structure of A with diagonal entries μ_1 and off-diagonal entries μ_2 (see Appendix A in (Covert & Lee, 2021)).
2. Exact computation of $\hat{\phi}_U$, which yields with Proposition 3.6 $\hat{\phi}_U(i) = \hat{I}_1^m(i)$, if $(\mu_1 - \mu_2)2h_{d-1} = 1$.
3. We show that $(\mu_1 - \mu_2)2h_{d-1} = 1$.

Calculation of A^{-1} . It has been shown in Appendix A in (Covert & Lee, 2021) that all off-diagonal entries are equal and all diagonal entries are equal, i.e. A may be written as $A = \mu_2 \mathbf{J} + (\mu_1 - \mu_2) \mathbf{I}$ with off-diagonal entries $\mu_2 := p(Z_i = Z_j = 1)$ and diagonal entries $\mu_1 := p(Z_i = 1)$, where Z_i refers to the i -th component of the binary vector Z and \mathbf{J} is a matrix of ones and \mathbf{I} is the identity matrix. The simple structure of A allows to compute the inverse exactly by using the following Lemma.

Lemma D.2. *Let $\mu_1, \mu_2 > 0$ with $\mu_1 \neq \mu_2$, then*

$$(\mu_2 \mathbf{J} + (\mu_1 - \mu_2) \mathbf{I})^{-1} = \tilde{\mu}_2 \mathbf{J} + (\tilde{\mu}_1 - \tilde{\mu}_2) \mathbf{I}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mu}_2 &= \frac{-\mu_2}{(\mu_1 - \mu_2)(\mu_1 + (d-1)\mu_2)} \\ \tilde{\mu}_1 &= \frac{\mu_1 + (d-2)\mu_2}{(\mu_1 - \mu_2)(\mu_1 + (d-1)\mu_2)}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We compute

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{I} &= (\mu_2 \mathbf{J} + (\mu_1 - \mu_2) \mathbf{I}) \cdot (\tilde{\mu}_2 \mathbf{J} + (\tilde{\mu}_1 - \tilde{\mu}_2) \mathbf{I}) \\ &= ((\mu_1 + (d-1)\mu_2)y + (\tilde{\mu}_1 - \tilde{\mu}_2)\mu_2) \mathbf{J} \\ &\quad + (\mu_1 - \mu_2)(\tilde{\mu}_1 - \tilde{\mu}_2) \mathbf{I},\end{aligned}$$

which yields $(\mu_1 - \mu_2)(\tilde{\mu}_1 - \tilde{\mu}_2) = 1$ and $\mu_2 \tilde{\mu}_2 M + (\mu_1 - \mu_2) \tilde{\mu}_1 + (\tilde{\mu}_1 - \tilde{\mu}_2) \mu_2 = 0$. From the first equation we have $\tilde{\mu}_1 - \tilde{\mu}_2 = 1/(\mu_1 - \mu_2)$ and thus by the second equation

$$\tilde{\mu}_2 = \frac{-\mu_2}{(\mu_1 - \mu_2)(\mu_1 + (d-1)\mu_2)}$$

and hence

$$\tilde{\mu}_1 = \frac{\mu_1 + (d-2)\mu_2}{(\mu_1 - \mu_2)(\mu_1 + (d-1)\mu_2)}$$

□

Calculation of $\hat{\phi}_U$. By Lemma D.2, we proceed to compute the different components of

$$\hat{\phi}_U := A^{-1} \left(\hat{b}_L - \mathbf{1} \frac{\mathbf{1}^T A^{-1} \hat{b}_L - \nu_0(\mathbf{1})}{\mathbf{1}^T A^{-1} \mathbf{1}} \right).$$

First,

$$\mathbf{1}^T A^{-1} = ((d-1)\tilde{\mu}_2 + \tilde{\mu}_1) \mathbf{1}^T = \frac{1}{\mu_1 + (d-1)\mu_2} \mathbf{1}^T.$$

Then the denominator yields $\mathbf{1}^T A^{-1} \mathbf{1} = \frac{d}{\mu_1 + (d-1)\mu_2}$. We then obtain

$$\mathbf{1} \frac{\mathbf{1}^T A^{-1} \hat{b}_L - \nu_0(\mathbf{1})}{\mathbf{1}^T A^{-1} \mathbf{1}} = \frac{1}{d} \mathbf{1} \mathbf{1}^T \hat{b}_L - \frac{\mu_1 + (d-1)\mu_2}{d} \nu_0(\mathbf{1}) \mathbf{1} = \frac{1}{d} \mathbf{J} \cdot \hat{b}_L + \frac{\mu_1 + (d-1)\mu_2}{d} \nu_0(\mathbf{1}) \cdot \mathbf{1},$$

which, with $A^{-1} \mathbf{1} = (\tilde{\mu}_1 + (d-1)\tilde{\mu}_2) \mathbf{1} = \frac{1}{\mu_1 + (d-1)\mu_2} \mathbf{1}$, yields

$$\hat{\phi}_U = A^{-1}(\hat{b}_L - \frac{1}{d} \mathbf{J} \cdot \hat{b}_L) + \frac{\nu_0(\mathbf{1})}{d} \cdot \mathbf{1} = c_1 + A^{-1}(\hat{b}_L - \frac{1}{d} \mathbf{J} \cdot \hat{b}_L).$$

It remains to show that

$$\left(A^{-1}(\hat{b}_L - \frac{1}{d} \mathbf{J} \cdot \hat{b}_L) \right)_i = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \nu_0(T_k) \frac{\gamma^m(t_k, \mathbf{1}(i \in T_k))}{p(T_k)}.$$

With $\hat{b}_L = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K z_k \nu_0(z_k)$ it follows

$$A^{-1}(\hat{b}_L - \frac{1}{d} \mathbf{J} \cdot \hat{b}_L) = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \left(A^{-1} z_k - \frac{1}{d} A^{-1} \mathbf{J} z_k \right) \nu_0(z_k).$$

Then $A^{-1} z_k = t_k \tilde{\mu}_2 \mathbf{1} + (\tilde{\mu}_1 - \tilde{\mu}_2) z_k$ where t_k is the subset size, i.e. t_k is the sum of all entries in z_k . It follows with $A^{-1} \mathbf{J} = \frac{1}{\mu_1 + (d-1)\mu_2} \mathbf{J}$

$$A^{-1} z_k - \frac{1}{d} A^{-1} \mathbf{J} z_k = t_k \left(\tilde{\mu}_2 - \frac{1}{d(\mu_1 + (d-1)\mu_2)} \right) \mathbf{1} + (\tilde{\mu}_1 - \tilde{\mu}_2) z_k = \frac{1}{\mu_1 - \mu_2} \left(z_k - \frac{t_k}{d} \mathbf{1} \right).$$

For the i -th component, we have with set notation T_k and for the SV weights $m(t) := \frac{(d-t-1)!t!}{d!}$ then

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\phi}_U(i) - c_1(i) &= \left(A^{-1}(\hat{b}_L - \frac{1}{d} \mathbf{J} \cdot \hat{b}_L) \right)_i = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \nu_0(T_k) \frac{1}{\mu_1 - \mu_2} \left(\mathbf{1}(i \in T_k) - \frac{t_k}{d} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{(\mu_1 - \mu_2) 2h_{d-1}} \left(\hat{I}_1^m(i) - c_1(i) \right),\end{aligned}$$

where we have used Proposition 3.6 for $\hat{I}_1^m(i)$. It remains to show that $(\mu_1 - \mu_2) 2h_{d-1} = 1$.

Show that $(\mu_1 - \mu_2)2h_{d-1} = 1$. We let $p(T_k) := \mu_{Sh}(t)/R$ be a probability distribution over \mathcal{T}_1 . By definition, and as subsets of size t have equal probability, we have

$$\mu_1 = p(Z_i = 1) = \sum_{t=1}^{d-1} p(Z_i = 1 | \mathbf{1}^T Z = t) p(\mathbf{1}^T Z = t) = \sum_{t=1}^{d-1} \frac{\binom{d-1}{t-1}}{\binom{d}{t}} \frac{\mu_{Sh}(t)}{R} \binom{d}{t} = \sum_{t=1}^{d-1} \binom{d-1}{t-1} \frac{\mu_{Sh}(t)}{R}$$

and

$$\mu_2 = p(Z_i = Z_j = 1) = \sum_{t=1}^{d-1} p(Z_i = Z_j = 1 | \mathbf{1}^T Z = t) p(\mathbf{1}^T Z = t) = \sum_{t=2}^{d-1} \frac{\binom{d-2}{t-2}}{\binom{d}{t}} \frac{\mu_{Sh}(t)}{R} \binom{d}{t} = \sum_{t=2}^{d-1} \binom{d-2}{t-2} \frac{\mu_{Sh}(t)}{R}.$$

Hence,

$$\mu_1 - \mu_2 = \frac{\mu_{Sh}(1)}{R} + \sum_{t=2}^{d-1} \frac{\mu_{Sh}(t)}{R} \left(\binom{d-1}{t-1} - \binom{d-2}{t-2} \right) = \sum_{t=1}^{d-1} \frac{\mu_{Sh}(t)}{R} \binom{d-2}{t-1} = \frac{1}{R},$$

where we have used the recursion for the binomial coefficient and $\mu_{Sh}(t) = \frac{1}{d-1} \binom{d-2}{t-1}^{-1}$. Lastly, we have seen in the proof of Proposition 3.6 that $R = 2h_{d-1}$, which finishes the proof. \square

D.3. Proofs of SHAP-IQ Efficiency

D.3.1. PROOF OF THEOREM 3.9

Proof. We consider interactions of maximum order $s_0 > 1$, summarized in $\mathcal{S} := \{S \subset D : |S| = s_0\}$. To show that SII and STI are s-efficient, by Theorem 3.1 it suffices to show that $\sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \gamma^m(t, |T \cap S|) = 0$ for all $T \in \mathcal{T}_{s_0}$. Given a subset $T \in \mathcal{T}_{s_0}$ with $|T \cap S| = k$ and $k \in \{0, \dots, s_0\}$, we have

$$\sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \gamma^m(t, |T \cap S|) = \sum_{k=0}^{s_0} \binom{t}{k} \binom{t-k}{s_0-k} \gamma^m(t, k) = \sum_{k=0}^{s_0} (-1)^{s_0-k} \binom{t}{k} \binom{d-t}{s_0-k} m(t-k).$$

We let $m(t) := m_{\text{SII}}(t) = \frac{(d-t-s_0)!t!}{(d-s_0+1)!} = \frac{1}{d-s_0+1} \binom{d-s_0}{t}^{-1}$ and obtain

$$\sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \gamma^m(t, |T \cap S|) = \frac{1}{d-s_0+1} \sum_{k=0}^{s_0} (-1)^{s_0-k} \binom{t}{k} \binom{d-t}{s_0-k} \binom{d-s_0}{t-k}^{-1}.$$

We now consider

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^{s_0} (-1)^k \binom{t}{k} \binom{d-t}{s_0-k} \binom{d-s_0}{t-k}^{-1} &= \sum_{k=0}^{s_0} (-1)^k \frac{t!}{k!(t-k)!} \frac{(d-t)!}{(s_0-k)!(d-t-s_0+k)!} \frac{(t-k)!(d-s_0-t+k)!}{(d-s_0)!} \\ &= \frac{t!(d-t)!}{(d-s_0)!} \sum_{k=0}^{s_0} (-1)^k \frac{1}{(s_0-k)!k!} \\ &= \frac{t!(d-t)!}{(s_0)!(d-s_0)!} \sum_{k=0}^{s_0} (-1)^k \binom{s_0}{k} \\ &= \frac{t!(d-t)!}{(s_0)!(d-s_0)!} (1-1)^{s_0} \\ &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the binomial expansion for $(1-1)^{s_0}$. Hence,

$$\sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \gamma^m(t, |T \cap S|) = 0,$$

which finishes the proof for SII.

For STI, i.e. $m_{\text{STI}} := s \frac{(d-t-1)!t!}{d!}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \gamma^m(t, |T \cap S|) &= \sum_{k=0}^{s_0} (-1)^{s_0-k} \binom{t}{k} \binom{d-t}{s_0-k} s \frac{(d-t+k-1)!(t-k)!}{d!} \\ &= \frac{s_0(-1)^{s_0} t!(d-t)!}{s_0! d!} \sum_{k=0}^{s_0} (-1)^k \binom{s_0}{k} \frac{(d-t+k-1)!}{(d-t-s_0+k)!} \end{aligned}$$

As $\frac{(d-t+k-1)!}{(d-t-s_0+k)!}$ is a polynomial with orders less than s_0 , we can use $\sum_{k=0}^{s_0} \binom{s_0}{k} k^m = 0$ for $m < s_0$ (Spivey, 2007) to obtain

$$\frac{s_0(-1)^{s_0} t!(d-t)!}{s_0! d!} \sum_{k=0}^{s_0} (-1)^k \binom{s_0}{k} \frac{(d-t+k-1)!}{(d-t-s_0+k)!} = 0,$$

which finishes the proof for STI. \square

D.3.2. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3.10

Proof. For SII, we let $m(t) := m_{\text{SII}}(t) = \frac{1}{d-s+1} \binom{d-s}{t}^{-1}$ and have by Theorem 3.9 and the definition of s-efficiency

$$\sum_{\substack{S \subset D \\ |S|=s_0}} I^m(S) = \sum_{\substack{S \subset D \\ |S|=s_0}} c_{s_0}(S) = \sum_{\substack{T \subset D \\ t < s_0}} \nu(T) \sum_{\substack{S \subset D \\ |S|=s_0}} \gamma^m(t, |T \cap S|) + \sum_{\substack{T \subset D \\ t > d-s_0}} \nu(T) \sum_{\substack{S \subset D \\ |S|=s_0}} \gamma^m(t, |T \cap S|)$$

For $t < s_0$ we have

$$\rho(t) := \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \gamma^m(t, |T \cap S|) = \sum_{k=0}^t \binom{t}{k} \binom{t-k}{s_0-k} \gamma^m(t, |T \cap S|) = \frac{1}{d-s_0+1} \sum_{k=0}^t (-1)^{s_0-k} \binom{t}{k} \binom{d-t}{s_0-k} \binom{d-s_0}{t-k}^{-1}.$$

For $t > d-s$ there are at least $k_{\min} = t - (d-s)$ elements in the intersection of $|T \cap S|$ and thus with $\bar{t} := d-t < s_0$ and $k_{\min} = s_0 - \bar{t}$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \gamma^m(t, |T \cap S|) &= \sum_{k=k_{\min}}^{s_0} \binom{t}{k} \binom{t-k}{s_0-k} \gamma^m(t, |T \cap S|) = \frac{1}{d-s_0+1} \sum_{k=k_{\min}}^{s_0} (-1)^{s_0-k} \binom{t}{k} \binom{d-t}{s_0-k} \binom{d-s_0}{t-k}^{-1} \\ &= \frac{1}{d-s_0+1} \sum_{k=s_0-\bar{t}}^{s_0} (-1)^{s_0-k} \binom{d-\bar{t}}{k} \binom{\bar{t}}{s_0-k} \binom{d-s_0}{d-\bar{t}-k}^{-1} \\ &= \frac{1}{d-s_0+1} \sum_{k=0}^{\bar{t}} (-1)^k \binom{d-\bar{t}}{s_0-k} \binom{\bar{t}}{k} \binom{d-s_0}{d-\bar{t}-s_0+k}^{-1} \\ &= \frac{1}{d-s_0+1} \sum_{k=0}^{\bar{t}} (-1)^k \binom{d-\bar{t}}{s_0-k} \binom{\bar{t}}{k} \binom{d-s_0}{\bar{t}-k}^{-1} \\ &= (-1)^{s_0} \rho(\bar{t}). \end{aligned}$$

We can explicitly compute $\rho(t)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(t) &= \frac{1}{d-s_0+1} \sum_{k=0}^t (-1)^{s_0-k} \binom{t}{k} \binom{d-t}{s_0-k} \binom{d-s_0}{t-k}^{-1} = (-1)^{s_0} \frac{t!(d-t)!}{(d-s_0+1)!} \sum_{k=0}^t (-1)^k \frac{1}{(s_0-k)!k!} \\ &= (-1)^{s_0} \frac{t!(d-t)!}{s_0!(d-s_0+1)!} \sum_{k=0}^t (-1)^k \binom{s_0}{k} = (-1)^{s_0} \frac{t!(d-t)!}{s_0!(d-s_0+1)!} \binom{s_0-1}{t} = \frac{(-1)^{s_0}}{s_0} \binom{d-t}{s_0-t-1}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $\sum_{k=0}^t (-1)^k \binom{s_0}{k} = \binom{s_0-1}{t}$ for $t < s_0$. Hence,

$$\sum_{\substack{S \subset D \\ |S|=s_0}} I^m(S) = \frac{1}{s_0} \sum_{\substack{T \subset D \\ t < s_0}} [(-1)^{s_0} \nu(T) + \nu(D \setminus T)] \binom{d-t}{s_0-t-1}.$$

□

E. Experiments

For the interested reader, we provide a more detailed view on our empirical evaluation of Section 4. We give descriptions and pseudocode of the baseline algorithms approximating the three considered Interaction-measures SSI, STI, and FSI, formal definitions of our synthetic games, and finally further obtained results that we omitted in the main part due to space constraints.

E.1. Baseline Algorithms for SII, STI, and FSI

In this section, we describe our baseline algorithms for SII, STI and FSI. We distinguish between permutation-based approximation (SII and STI) and kernel-based approximation (FSI).

E.1.1. PERMUTATION-BASED APPROXIMATION

The algorithm for SII is outlined in Algorithm E.1.1. Note that with each permutation only $d - s_0 + 1$ interaction estimates can be updated.

Algorithm 5 Permutation-based sampling for SII (Tsai et al., 2022)

Require: maximum interaction order s_0 , interaction set \mathcal{S} , budget K

```

1: sum[S] ← 0 for all  $S \in \mathcal{S}$ 
2: count[S] ← 0 for all  $S \in \mathcal{S}$ 
3: for  $k = 1, \dots, K$  do
4:    $\pi \leftarrow \{i_1, \dots, i_d\}$  random permutation of  $D$ 
5:   for  $m = 1, \dots, d - s_0 + 1$  do
6:      $S \leftarrow \{i_m, \dots, i_{m+s_0-1}\}$ 
7:      $T \leftarrow \{i_1, \dots, i_{m-1}\}$  the set of predecessors of  $i_m$  in  $\pi$ 
8:     sum[S] ← sum[S] +  $\delta_S^\nu(T)$ 
9:     count[S] = count[S]+1
10:  end for
11: end for
12: SII[S] ← sum[S]/count[S] for all  $S \in \mathcal{S}$ .
13: return SII

```

The algorithm for STI is outlined in Algorithm E.1.1. Note that with each permutation all interaction estimates can be updated.

E.1.2. KERNEL-BASED APPROXIMATION

Given a budget of K , we first find the sampling budget by identifying k_0 according to Algorithm C.1 with weights $q(t) := \mu_{Sh}(t)$ and subtracting the number of subsets used for the deterministic part. We then sample the remaining subsets according to $p(T) \propto \mu_{Sh}$ according to Algorithm C.1.

Algorithm 6 Permutation-based sampling for STI (Sundararajan et al., 2020; Tsai et al., 2022)

Require: maximum interaction order s_0 , interaction set \mathcal{S} , budget K

```

1: sum[S]  $\leftarrow$  0 for all  $S \in \mathcal{S}$ 
2: count[S]  $\leftarrow$  0 for all  $S \in \mathcal{S}$ 
3: for  $k = 1, \dots, K$  do
4:    $\pi \leftarrow \{i_1, \dots, i_d\}$  random permutation of  $D$ 
5:   for all interactions  $S \in \mathcal{S}$  do
6:      $i_m \leftarrow$  the leftmost element of  $S$  in  $\pi$ 
7:      $T \leftarrow \{i_1, \dots, i_{m-1}\}$  the set of predecessors of  $i_m$  in  $\pi$ 
8:     sum[S]  $\leftarrow$  sum[S] +  $\delta_S^\nu(T)$ 
9:     count[S] = count[S]+1
10:  end for
11: end for
12: SII[S]  $\leftarrow$  sum[S]/count[S] for all  $S \in \mathcal{S}$ .
13: return STI
    
```

Given the collection of K subsets (deterministic and sampled), we solve the weighted least square objective described as

$$\hat{I}_{\text{KB}}^{m_{\text{FSI}}} := \arg \min_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{s_0}}} \sum_{k=1}^K \mu_{Sh}(t_k) \left(\nu(T_k) - \sum_{\substack{S \in \mathcal{S} \\ S \subset T_k}} \beta(S) \right)^2$$

s.t. $\sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \beta(S) = \nu(D)$ and $\beta(\emptyset) = \nu(\emptyset)$.

To do so, we compute the exact solution for the approximate problem

$$\phi = (\mathbf{Z}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{Z})^{-1} \mathbf{Z}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{y}, \quad (5)$$

where $Z \in \{0, 1\}^{K \times d_{s_0}}$ is a matrix that represents a binary encoding for each sampled subset where an entry in column $S \in \mathcal{S}$ is equal to one, if the subset contains S and zero otherwise. The matrix $W \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times K}$ contains the weights $\mu_{Sh}(t)$ for each subset on the diagonal. The vector \mathbf{y} consists of all model evaluations $\nu_0(T)$, where T is in the collection of subsets. To include the optimization constraint, we add D, \emptyset to the collection with weight set to a high positive constant (mimicking infinite). The algorithm is outlined in Algorithm E.1.2.

E.2. Further Information about the Models

E.2.1. SUM OF UNANIMITY MODEL

Definition E.1 (Sum of Unanimity Model (SOUM)). For N subsets $Q_1, \dots, Q_N \subset D$ and coefficients $a_1, \dots, a_N \in \mathbb{R}$ the *linear unanimity game* is defined as

$$\nu(T) := \sum_{n=1}^N a_n \mathbf{1}(Q_n \subset T).$$

For linear unanimity games, it is possible to efficiently compute the ground-truth values for SI.

Proposition E.2 (Ground-truth values). *For a linear unanimity game, it holds*

$$I_\nu^m(S) = \sum_{n=1}^N a_n \omega(t, q, |S \cap Q_n|),$$

with

$$\omega(t, q, r) = \sum_{t=q}^d \sum_{k=0}^{k_{\max}(r)} \binom{d-q-(s-r)}{t-q-k} \binom{s-r}{k} \gamma^m(t, k+r)$$

and $k_{\max}(r) := \min(t-q, s-r)$

Algorithm 7 Kernel-based approximation of FSI (Lundberg & Lee, 2017; Tsai et al., 2022)

Require: maximum interaction order s_0 , budget K , high constant $c_0 \gg 0$.

```

1:  $k_0 \leftarrow \text{GETSAMPLINGORDER}(q, K)$ 
2:  $W \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times K}$  with one row and column per subset
3:  $W[D, D] \leftarrow c_0$ 
4:  $W[\emptyset, \emptyset] \leftarrow c_0$ 
5:  $\mathbf{Z} \leftarrow [\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{0}]^T$  of size  $d_{s_0}$ .
6:  $\mathbf{y} \leftarrow [\nu_0(D), \nu_0(\emptyset)]^T$ .
7:  $K \leftarrow K - 2$ .
8: for  $T \notin \mathcal{T}$  do ▷ Deterministic
9:    $\mathbf{Z} \leftarrow \text{APPENDROW}(\mathbf{Z}, \text{BINARY}(T))$ 
10:   $\mathbf{y} \leftarrow \text{APPENDROW}(\mathbf{y}, \nu_0(T))$ 
11:   $\mathbf{W}(T, T) \leftarrow \mu_{Sh}(|T|)$ 
12:   $K \leftarrow K - 1$ 
13: end for
14: for  $t = k_0, \dots, d - k_0$  do
15:    $p(t) \leftarrow q(t) / \left( \sum_{k=k_0}^{d-k_0} q(k) \binom{d}{k} \right)$ 
16: end for
17: for  $k = 1, \dots, K$  do ▷ Sampling
18:    $T \leftarrow \text{SAMPLE}(p, k_0)$ 
19:    $\mathbf{Z} \leftarrow \text{APPENDROW}(\mathbf{Z}, \text{BINARY}(T))$ 
20:    $\mathbf{y} \leftarrow \text{APPENDROW}(\mathbf{y}, \nu_0(T))$ 
21:    $\mathbf{W}(T, T) \leftarrow \mu_{Sh}(|T|)$ 
22: end for
23:  $\text{FSI} \leftarrow \text{SOLVEWLS}(\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{W}, \mathbf{y})$ .
24: return FSI
    
```

Proof. Due to the linearity of SI, it suffices to compute the SI for $\nu_Q(T) := \mathbf{1}(Q \subset T)$. By Theorem 3.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 I_{\nu_Q}^m(S) &= \sum_{T \subset D} \mathbf{1}(Q \subset T) \gamma^m(t, |T \cap S|) = \sum_{t=q}^d \sum_{k=0}^{k_{max}} \binom{d-q-(s-|S \cap Q|)}{t-q-k} \binom{s-|S \cap Q|}{k} \gamma^m(t, k+|S \cap Q|) \\
 &=: \omega(t, q, |S \cap Q|),
 \end{aligned}$$

where we used that $Q \cap S \subset T \cap S$ due to $\mathbf{1}(Q \subset T)$ and $|T \cap S| = |S \cap Q| + (|T \cap S| \setminus |S \cap Q|)$, where $k := (|T \cap S| \setminus |S \cap Q|)$ ranges from 0 to $k_{max} := \min(t - q, s - |S \cap Q|)$. Since $S \cap Q$ is fixed, we need to count the number of subsets T of size t , given k , such that $|T \cap S| = |S \cap Q| + k$. We count $\binom{s-|S \cap Q|}{k}$ ways to choose subsets of elements that are not in $S \cap Q$ but are in S . Then $q - (s - |S \cap Q|)$ elements of T are fixed. We thus select from $d - q - (s - |S \cap Q|)$ elements exactly $t - q - k$ elements, as q and k elements are already contained in T .

Finally, the SI value is given as

$$I_{\nu}^m(S) = \sum_{n=1}^N a_n \omega(t, q, |S \cap Q_n|),$$

where the weights ω can be precomputed with $|S \cap Q_n| \in \{0, \dots, s\}$. □

E.3. Further Results for Language Models

Next to $s_0 = 2$ and $s_0 = 1$ (Section 4.2), we further compute interaction scores for $s_0 = 4$ and $s_0 = 3$. All results are summarized in Figure 4. We further probe the LM with random sentences from the *IMDB* (Maas et al., 2011) dataset and visualize the top interactions for three example sentences for SII, STI, and FSI in Table 2. For the first and second sentence in Table 2, we see that the positive and negative sentiment originates from the similar words (tokens) in the sentence for all three interaction indices. In the third, sentence the sign of the interaction scores is different for FSI, compared to STI, and SII for the same top interacting words. The last row seems can be interpreted as a miss-classification (False Positive) by the LM. The words with the top interaction score for SII differ from the words identified by STI, and FSI.




Figure 4. Approximation Quality for the language model with interaction order $s_0 = 4$ for $g = 10$ iterations (first row), with interaction order $s_0 = 3$ for $g = 50$ iterations (second row), with interaction order $s_0 = 2$ for $g = 50$ iterations (third row), and with interaction order $s_0 = 1$ (Shapley Value) for $g = 50$ iterations (fourth row).

Table 2. Example movie review sentences presented to the LM and the corresponding interactions of order s_0 .

interaction index	movie review	model output	s_0	interaction score
SII	I've discovered this movie accidentally and it was really a nice surprise .	Positive	3	0.297
STI	I've discovered this movie accidentally and it was really a nice surprise .	(0.984)		0.652
FSI	I've discovered this movie accidentally and it was really a nice surprise .			0.187
SII	I don't recommend you watching this movie if you are easily offended.	Negative	2	-0.507
STI	I don't recommend you watching this movie if you are easily offended.	(-0.959)		-0.549
FSI	I don't recommend you watching this movie if you are easily offended.			-0.543
SII	I just saw A Tale of Two Sisters last night and really enjoyed it .	Positive	2	0.239
STI	I just saw A Tale of Two Sisters last night and really enjoyed it .	(0.994)		0.433
FSI	I just saw A Tale of Two Sisters last night and really enjoyed it .			-0.110
SII	Ten minutes worth of story stretched out into the better part of two hours.	Positive	2	0.426
STI	Ten minutes worth of story stretched out into the better part of two hours.	(0.839)		0.535
FSI	Ten minutes worth of story stretched out into the better part of two hours.			0.387

E.4. Further Results for Synthetic Models

We provide further experimental results for SOUM with $d = 30$ features. We evaluate MSE, MSE@10 and P@10 for interactions of size $s_0 = 2, 3, 4$, where we used 50 iterations for $s_0 = 2, 3$ and 10 iterations for $s_0 = 4$. We consider different settings for SOUM, where we set the number of randomly generated interactions to $N = 30, 100$ with maximum interaction size of $l_{\max} = 10, 15, 20, 25, 30$. We display our results for $N = 100$ in Figure 5 and for $N = 30$ in Figure 6.

Results. Again, we observe that SHAP-IQ outperforms the baseline methods for more complex models ($l_{\max} = 20, 25, 30$) and is outperformed by the baseline methods for very sparse models $l_{\max} = 10$. For $l_{\max} = 15$ the performance is comparable. Interestingly, the performance of SHAP-IQ is better, if MSE@10 is used as evaluation metric. This indicates that top-interactions are estimated more accurately. Furthermore, for $N = 30$ the difference in performance is less than in case for $N = 100$ for sparse SOUM ($l_{\max} = 10$).

SHAP-IQ: Unified Approximation of any-order Shapley Interactions




Figure 5. Approximation Quality for interaction order $s_0 = 2$ for $g = 50$ iterations on the SOUM with $N = 100$ interactions, $d = 30$ features, and $\ell_{\max} = 10$ (first row), $\ell_{\max} = 15$ (second row), $\ell_{\max} = 20$ (third row), $\ell_{\max} = 25$ (fourth row), and $\ell_{\max} = 30$ (fifth row).

SHAP-IQ: Unified Approximation of any-order Shapley Interactions




Figure 6. Approximation Quality for interaction order $s_0 = 2$ for $g = 50$ iterations on the SOUM with $N = 30$ interactions, $d = 30$ features, and $\ell_{\max} = 10$ (first row), $\ell_{\max} = 15$ (second row), $\ell_{\max} = 20$ (third row), $\ell_{\max} = 25$ (fourth row), and $\ell_{\max} = 30$ (fifth row).