

Feature Importance versus Feature Influence and What It Signifies for Explainable AI*

Kary Främling^{1,2}[0000–0002–8078–5172]

¹ Umeå University, 901 87 Umeå, Sweden

² Aalto University, 02150 Espoo, Finland

kary.framling@cs.umu.se

<https://www.umu.se/personal/kary-framling/>

Abstract. When used in the context of decision theory, *feature importance* expresses how much changing the value of a feature can change the model outcome (or the *utility* of the outcome), compared to other features. Feature importance should not be confused with the *feature influence* used by most state-of-the-art post-hoc Explainable AI methods. Contrary to feature importance, feature influence is measured against a *reference level* or *baseline*. The Contextual Importance and Utility (CIU) method provides a unified definition of global and local feature importance that is applicable also for post-hoc explanations, where the *value utility* concept provides instance-level assessment of how favorable or not a feature value is for the outcome. The paper shows how CIU can be applied to both global and local explainability, assesses the fidelity and stability of different methods, and shows how explanations that use contextual importance and contextual utility can provide more expressive and flexible explanations than when using influence only.

Keywords: Explainable AI · Feature importance · Feature influence · Contextual Importance and Utility · Additive Feature Attribution.

1 Introduction

Explainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI) is probably as old as AI itself and papers even from the 1970's such as [20] can still give valuable insight to XAI researchers. A relatively small but active XAI community existed in the 1990's, which tended to focus on building rule-based surrogate models of trained neural networks [1]. The *Contextual Importance and Utility (CIU)* method was presented in [8,7] at the same epoch and proposed a different approach, where only the outcome of the black-box model for a specific instance was justified and explained, which is nowadays often called *post-hoc explanation*. However, it seems like CIU was forgotten since then.

This paper revisits the theoretical foundations of CIU and the core differences between CIU and current state-of-the-art methods. Notably, we show that

* The work is partially supported by the Wallenberg AI, Autonomous Systems and Software Program (WASP) funded by the Knut and Alice Wallenberg Foundation.

“contextual importance” is compatible with the notion of “global feature importance” but extends it to the case of instance-level post-hoc explanation. We also show that influence values produced by so called Additive Feature Attribution (AFA) methods [15] are not compatible with global feature importance. Finally, we compare the methods experimentally using general-purpose criteria.

After this Introduction, Section 2 goes through the theory of global feature importance and AFA methods, followed by a presentation of CIU and new theory in Section 3. Section 4 experimentally compares CIU with the methods presented in Section 2, followed by Conclusions.

2 Background

When explaining the outcome of a model f , we are interested in how each feature (or possibly groups of features) affects the prediction of the instance being explained. For a linear model it is easy to identify the importance and influence of each feature, where the prediction for an instance x is:

$$f(x) = w_0 + w_1x_1 + \dots + w_Nx_N. \quad (1)$$

Each x_i is a feature value, with $i = 1, \dots, N$ and w_i is the weight associated with the feature i . Such linear models are considered understandable to humans and are therefore often used as so-called surrogate models g for explaining the outcome also for non-linear models, such as those produced by machine learning methods.

However, there are fundamental differences in how different XAI methods define *feature importance* in Equation 1, versus *feature influence*. In decision theory and most other contexts, the feature importance for a linear model like Equation 1 is considered to be w_i for feature i [5,11]. This is the definition that we adopt also in this paper. In *multi-attribute utility theory (MAUT)*, x_i is replaced by a *utility value* given by a *utility function* $u_i(x_i)$ [4].

On the other hand, the state-of-the-art XAI method Shapley value calculates an influence value ϕ_i for each feature. For a linear model as in Equation 1, the Shapley value ϕ_i of the i -th feature on the prediction $f(x)$ is:

$$\phi_i(x) = w_ix_i - E(w_iX_i) = w_ix_i - w_iE(X_i), \quad (2)$$

where $E(w_iX_i)$ is the mean effect estimate for feature i [21]. This influence value $\phi_i(x)$ depends on the instance x and is clearly not the same as the importance w_i .

The concepts of importance, utility, utility function and influence can be illustrated by an example of how the weighted average grade of a university student is calculated. The weight w_i of each course is the number of credits that can be obtained for the course and corresponds to the importance of the course. The utility value u_i of each course is the obtained grade in percent, *i.e.* normalized into range $[0, 1]$ by a utility function $u_i(x_i)$, where x_i is the original grade. The result $u = \sum_{i=1}^N w_iu_i(x_i)$ is normalized to the range $[0, 1]$ by dividing the weights

w_i by the sum of all weights. Finally, the weighted average grade is scaled from the range $[0, 1]$ to the desired output range using the utility function $u(y)$, *e.g.* $[0, 1] \mapsto [4, 10]$. The desired output range tends to vary between schools, universities and countries.

The question is then: “where do we have ‘influence’ in the calculation of weighted average grade?”. The answer is “nowhere”, unless we introduce a baseline or reference level, which would normally be the average grade for the group of reference students that we want to compare with. The ϕ_i values from Equation 2 would then indicate which courses had a negative or positive influence compared to the average of the reference population (*e.g.* students following the same cursus the same year), and a magnitude for that influence.

2.1 Global Feature Importance

In a machine learning context, global feature importance describes how much covariates contribute to a prediction model’s accuracy, which differs from how decision theory defines it. However, both definitions are similar in practice as long as we only consider linear models, which is shown by the results in Section 4.

Estimating global feature importance can be done in many ways, as described *e.g.* in [6]. One commonly used method is the permutation-based feature importance (PFI) approach proposed in [3], which works by calculating the increase of the model’s prediction error after permuting the feature values. A feature is “important” if permuting its values increases the model error, because the model relied on the feature for the prediction. A feature is “unimportant” if permuting its values keeps the model error unchanged, because the model ignored the feature for the prediction.

2.2 Additive Feature Attribution Methods

The concept of AFA methods was introduced in [15], where a set of XAI methods were identified that belong to this family. AFA methods use an *explanation model* g that is an interpretable approximation of the original model f , according to the following definition.

Definition 1. *AFA methods have an explanation model that is a linear function of binary variables:*

$$g(z') = \phi_0 + \sum_{i=1}^M \phi_i z'_i, \quad (3)$$

where $z' \in \{0, 1\}^M$, $M \leq N$ is the number of simplified input features, and $\phi \in \mathbb{R}$.

According to [14], Shapley values represent the only possible method in the broad class of AFA methods that will simultaneously satisfy three important properties: *local accuracy*, *consistency*, and *missingness*. Local accuracy states that when

approximating the original model f for a specific input x , the explanation’s influence values should sum up to the difference $f(x) - \phi_0$.

The Shapley value is a solution concept that assigns a pay-off to each agent according to their marginal contribution [19]. Focusing on feature i , the Shapley value approach will test the accuracy of every combination of features not including feature i and then test how adding x_i to each combination improves the accuracy. Computing Shapley values is computationally expensive so most model-agnostic implementations only estimate approximate Shapley values, such as *Kernel SHAP* [15]. Kernel SHAP is essentially an adaptation of another AFA method, the Local Interpretable Model-agnostic Explanations (LIME) method [18], to estimate Shapley values. There are also model-specific methods for estimating Shapley values, such as Deep SHAP and Tree SHAP [14].

Shapley values are “local” in the sense that they are calculated for a specific instance x . However, in [14] it was suggested that $mean(|\phi_i|)$ could be used as a global feature importance estimate, when calculated over the entire training set and where influence values ϕ_i are Shapley values. They compare their approach with three well-known global feature importance methods and conclude that $mean(|\phi_i|)$ provides a better estimate of global feature importance. However, it can be questioned whether the use of influence values for estimating importance values is reasonable. As shown in this paper, contextual importance is mathematically similar to global feature importance. Different approaches for estimating global feature importance are used in Section 4 that highlight these differences.

Shapley value and LIME are presumably the most used methods for the moment within the category of model-agnostic post-hoc XAI. Shapley value seem to become the dominating method due to its mathematical properties, as explained above. However, for instance [13] recently pointed out several mathematical and human-centric issues with the use of Shapley value for XAI purposes. The mathematical issues concern how influence values are estimated and whether to use conditional or interventional distributions. Even in simple cases, the Shapley value is conceptually limited for non-additive models. Human-centric issues are mainly that Shapley value supports contrastive explanations only in comparison with the mean influence $E(w_i X_i)$ and are difficult to use for producing other kinds of counterfactual explanations. It is also noted that even when an individual lacks a correct mental model of the meaning of Shapley values, the explainee may use them to justify their evaluation anyways, whether or not this analysis is well-founded. In general, it is a problem if the explainability method is a black-box itself because then the explainee tends to interpret the explanations according to assumptions that might be false.

3 Contextual Importance and Utility

CIU is inspired from MAUT, which addresses the question of how humans can express their preferences and how they can be modelled mathematically in order to build human-understandable decision support systems. CIU uses core MAUT

concepts of feature importance and utility value and specifies how they can be estimated for any model $f(x)$ and a specific instance or *Context* x . In MAUT, an N-attribute utility function is a weighted sum:

$$u(y) = u(x_1, \dots, x_N) = \sum_{i=1}^N w_i u_i(x_i), \quad (4)$$

where $u_i(x_i)$ are the utility functions that correspond to the features x_1, \dots, x_N . $u_i(x_i)$ are constrained to the range $[0,1]$, as well as $u(y)$ through the positive weights w_i .

When studying a general (presumably non-linear) model $f(x)$, there are no known w_i values, so we need a way to estimate those values.

Contextual Importance (CI). CI takes the range of variation of the output as the importance value to estimate, which we can do by observing changes in output values when modifying input values of the feature i and keeping the values of the other features at those given by the studied instance x . This principle can be extended to more than one feature and we will use the notion of input index set $\{i\}$ in the CIU equations that follow. For an input index set $\{i\}$, the values of the features $\neg\{i\}$ are defined by the instance x . We extend the definition further to the importance of $\{i\}$ versus another set of inputs $\{I\}$, where $\{i\} \subseteq \{I\} \subseteq 1, \dots, N$. This gives us an estimation of the range $[umin_{j,\{i\},\{I\}}(x), umax_{j,\{i\},\{I\}}(x)]$, where j is the index of the model output to explain. CI is defined as:

$$\omega_{j,\{i\},\{I\}}(x) = \frac{umax_{j,\{i\}}(x) - umin_{j,\{i\}}(x)}{umax_{j,\{I\}}(x) - umin_{j,\{I\}}(x)}, \quad (5)$$

where we use the symbol ω for CI. If the model $f(x)$ is linear, then $\omega_{j,\{i\},\{I\}}(x)$ is identical for all/any instance x and is therefore also the global feature importance. If the model is non-linear, then $\omega_{j,\{i\},\{I\}}(x)$ depends on the instance x and is “local” or *contextual*.

Since the model f produces actual output values rather than utility values, the utility values $umin_j$ and $umax_j$ in Equation 5 have to be mapped to actual output values $y_j = f(x)$. If f is a classification model, then the outputs y_j are typically estimated probabilities for the corresponding class, so the output value is also the utility value, *i.e.* $u_j(y_j) = y_j$. For many (or most) regression tasks, a utility function of the form $u_j(y_j) = Ay_j + b$ is applicable (and also applies to $u_j(y_j) = y_j$). When the utility function is of form $u_j(y_j) = Ay_j + b$, then CI can be calculated as:

$$\omega_{j,\{i\},\{I\}}(x) = \frac{ymax_{j,\{i\}}(x) - ymin_{j,\{i\}}(x)}{ymax_{j,\{I\}}(x) - ymin_{j,\{I\}}(x)}, \quad (6)$$

where $ymin_j()$ and $ymax_j()$ are the minimal and maximal y_j values observed for output j .

Contextual Utility (CU). CU corresponds to the factor $u_i(x_i)$ in Equation 4. CU expresses to what extent the current values of features in $\{i\}$ contribute to obtaining a high output utility u_j . CU is defined as

$$CU_{j,\{i\}}(x) = \frac{u_j(x) - \text{umin}_{j,\{i\}}(x)}{\text{umax}_{j,\{i\}}(x) - \text{umin}_{j,\{i\}}(x)}. \quad (7)$$

When $u_j(y_j) = Ay_j + b$, this can be written as:

$$CU_{j,\{i\}}(x) = \left| \frac{y_j(x) - \text{yumin}_{j,\{i\}}(x)}{\text{ymax}_{j,\{i\}}(x) - \text{ymin}_{j,\{i\}}(x)} \right|, \quad (8)$$

where $\text{yumin} = \text{ymin}$ if A is positive and $\text{yumin} = \text{ymax}$ if A is negative.

Contextual Influence. Contextual Influence defines feature influence in a similar way as in Equation 2 but using $w_i u_i(x_i)$ instead of $w_i x_i$. This gives us

$$\phi_i(x) = \omega_i(x)(u_i(x_i) - E(U(x_i))), \quad (9)$$

where $E(U(x_i))$ is the expected utility value for feature i . Since utility $u \in [0, 1]$ for all features, it intuitively makes sense to use the average utility value 0.5 as a constant baseline for all features, even though it can be any value in the range $[0, 1]$ that makes sense for the application. For consistency, this constant is called ϕ_0 as in Equation 3. When including subset indices for CI and CU, we get the following equation for contextual influence:

$$\phi_{j,\{i\},\{I\}}(x) = \omega_{j,\{i\},\{I\}}(x)(CU_{j,\{i\}}(x) - \phi_0). \quad (10)$$

Contextual influence makes it possible to produce influence-based explanations like for AFA methods, in addition to the explanations based on CI and CU.

It should be emphasized that the baseline ϕ_0 of contextual influence has a constant and semantic meaning, *i.e.* “averagely good/bad”, “averagely typical” *etc.*, that presumably makes sense to humans when used in explanations. It is also entirely data- and model-agnostic, which makes it different from the AFA baseline in Equation 2.

Estimation of CI and CU Most model-agnostic post-hoc XAI methods only attempt to estimate the importance/influence of one feature i on the output, with the assumption that features are independent. In this paper, we limit the scope to that case and do not consider coalitions of features or CIU’s *intermediate concepts* as presented in [8,7,9]³. Therefore, we only need to consider the case when $\{i\}$ has one single index and the case when $\{I\} = 1, \dots, N$ in Equations 5, 7 and 10 (and Equations 6 and 8). $\{I\} = 1, \dots, N$ signifies all inputs jointly, which by definition means that $\text{umin}_{j,\{I\}} = 0$ and $\text{umax}_{j,\{I\}} = 1$ for all instances x .

³ Intermediate concepts also deal with dependencies between features. However, in this paper we assume that the features are independent, as is the case for Shapley value and LIME too.

Therefore, $umax_{j,\{I\}}(x) - umin_{j,\{I\}}(x) = 1 \ \forall x$. If we have a classification task where $u_i(y_j) = y_j$, then we also have $y_{max_{j,\{I\}}}(x) - y_{min_{j,\{I\}}}(x) = 1 \ \forall x$ and in a regression task with $u_j(y_j) = Ay_j + b$, $y_{min_{j,\{I\}}}$ and $y_{max_{j,\{I\}}}$ are calculated accordingly. If the actual model gives values outside this range, then the model is over-shooting at least in some parts of the input space.




Fig. 1. Output value y as a function of one feature value for the four models, with illustration of CIU calculations. The red dot shows the x_i value of the instance to be explained for the feature i . The output range $[MIN, MAX]$ is $[0, 1]$ for all models, except for the “non-linear” model where it is $[-0.825, 2.29]$. The labels in the Figure are $MIN = y_{min_j}$, $MAX = y_{max_j}$, $y_{min} = y_{min_{j,\{i\}}}(x)$, $y_{max} = y_{max_{j,\{i\}}}(x)$, $y = y_j(x)$ and $y(u(0)) = y_{min} + \phi_0(y_{max} - y_{min})$.

The approach proposed in [10] is used for estimating y_{min} and y_{max} ⁴. For categorical features, the approach uses all possible values. For numerical features the model is sampled using a set of instances consisting of **1**) the instance x , **2**) the instance x with feature i value replaced by the smallest possible value for feature i (min_i), **3**) the instance x with feature i value replaced by the greatest

⁴ The approach in [10] is applicable to any feature set $\{i\}$ and $\{I\}$, including $1, \dots, N$.

possible value for feature i (max_i), and **4**) a set of instances where the value of feature i is replaced with a random value from the interval $[min_{\{i\}}, max_{\{i\}}]$. This approach guarantees exact values for $ymin_j$ and $ymax_j$ if $f(x)$ is monotonous, or in practice if $ymin_j$ and $ymax_j$ values are found at the input values $min_{\{i\}}$ and $max_{\{i\}}$. If $min_{\{i\}}$ and $max_{\{i\}}$ values are not pre-defined, then they can be determined from the training data set. The calculation of CI and CU values with different data sets and models is illustrated in Fig. 1 using input/output value plots like in [7], also called *ceteris paribus* or *what-if* plots in [2]. CIU values can be “read” directly from such plots, which makes CIU transparent at least when compared to AFA methods that might be considered black-boxes themselves.

The sampling approach that is used can lead to so called out of distribution (OOD) samples, *i.e.* feature value combinations that are significantly different from the data in the training set used to build an ML model. For such samples, the model f may be incapable to provide correct output values y_j . OOD challenges related to the used sampling method and potential solutions to those challenges can be grouped into at least the three following cases:

1. **Predictable OOD behaviour.** If OOD samples do not lead to undershooting of the $ymin$ value, nor to overshooting of the $ymax$ value, then OOD is not an issue. Ensemble learning models typically do not under- or overshoot even when extrapolating outside the training set. In [7] for instance, CIU was used with an radial basis function (RBF) net that guaranteed that under- or overshooting does not occur. Input-output value graphs such as those in Fig. 1 can be used for studying the model behaviour within the value ranges used by CIU.
2. **Non-predictable OOD behaviour.** This happens if under- or overshooting may occur with OOD samples. In that case the sampling approach used here will not be appropriate. Various approaches could be imagined for addressing this problem, such as only using samples that are “sufficiently” close to samples in the training set.
3. **Detecting model instability.** Since CI and CU values are in the range $[0, 1]$ by definition, obtaining values that are outside this range indicate that the model undershoots or overshoots the permissible range for one or more samples. This could be an indication that those samples should be removed or that the model should be corrected in order to increase its trustworthiness. A correction approach using what what is called pseudo-examples was proposed in [8].

The second and third cases are considered to be out of scope for the current paper and remain topics of further research. It is also worth mentioning that similar OOD challenges exist for all model-agnostic XAI methods (at least for the permutation-based ones), including Shapley value and LIME. We do not consider model-specific methods here, such as TreeSHAP for Shapley values [14].

4 Results

All used software is written in R and is available as open-source on Github, including the source code for producing the results shown here. The caret package [12] is used for all machine learning models. The IML package is used for Shapley value calculations [16] and the ‘lime’ package for LIME [17]. The CIU implementation and results use the ‘ciu’ package [10] as a base. The default parameters are used for all packages unless stated otherwise. The experiments were run using Rstudio Version 1.3.1093 on a MacBook Pro, with 2.3 GHz 8-Core Intel Core i9 processor, 16 GB 2667 MHz DDR4 memory, and AMD Radeon Pro 5500M 4 GB graphics card.




Fig. 2. Distribution of ϕ values from 50 runs with the studied data sets / models and the studied methods.

The “Elapsed” times shown in the results are indicated as “real time” (“elapsed” value of *system.time()* function) and have been collected for all methods during the same session in order to keep them as comparable as possible. Therefore, the exact values are not significant but only the ratio between the execution times of the different methods. It should also be emphasized that execution times do not depend only on the method itself but also on the used implementation and other factors. Parameters such as sample size have been set to be identical for all the methods. However, for sampling-based methods there is always a compromise between sample size (and execution time) versus the precision (variance) of the result. Therefore, the expectation is that the longer the execution time, the lower the variance. So a method with short execution time and low variance is preferred to a method with long execution time and high variance.

In order to make global feature importance values comparable, they have been normalised to the range $[0, 1]$ for PFI and Shapley value by dividing with the sum of importance of all features. CI values are by definition in the range $[0, 1]$. Unlike Shapley values, it doesn't seem like LIME values would have been used, or proposed to be used, for estimating global feature importance. Therefore LIME has not been included in the global feature importance experiments and results.

For the instance-specific experiments, instances that have average (or close to average) feature values have been chosen, except for the Titanic instance where we use the same instance as in [2]. The reason for this choice is that such instances illustrate the difference between importance and influence as clearly as possible. The importance ω_i of a feature does not depend on the feature's value x_i , whereas its influence value ϕ_i depends on x_i in a way that gives close to zero ϕ_i values when x_i is "average".

4.1 Known Linear Function

We begin with a known linear function, for which we know the feature importances (weights) w_i as well as the $E(X_i)$ values. Therefore we know the correct results for CI, CU, Contextual influence and Shapley value. In addition to these, we include experiments with LIME. The function is:

$$f(x) = 0.4x_1 + 0.3x_2 + 0.2x_3 + 0.1x_4$$

Table 1. Global importance of features for the known linear function, averaged over 50 iterations. CI and Shapley used 1000 randomly selected instances at each iteration. CI values are identical for all instances, so CI has zero variance.

Feature	PFI-MAE	CI	Shapley
x_1	0.4 ± 0.0	0.4 ± 0	0.40 ± 0.05
x_2	0.3 ± 0.0	0.3 ± 0	0.30 ± 0.04
x_3	0.2 ± 0.0	0.2 ± 0	0.20 ± 0.04
x_4	0.1 ± 0.0	0.1 ± 0	0.10 ± 0.02
<i>Elapsed</i>	<i>1460s.</i>	<i>713s.</i>	<i>27786s.</i>

CIU can use the function directly as the studied model, whereas the other methods require the availability of a training set and a trained model. The training data set consisted of all possible value combinations of the four features x_i in the range $[0, 1]$ with a step of 0.05, *i.e.* 194481 instances. The trained linear model achieved $R^2 = 1$. All results are reported for the trained linear model.

Table 2. Local importance, utility and influence values by different methods for the known linear function. The numbers show mean values over 50 iterations.

Feature	CI	CU	ϕ_{CIU}	$\phi_{Shapley}$	ϕ_{LIME}
$x_1 = 0.5$	0.4	0.5	0	0.004	-0.003
$x_2 = 0.5$	0.3	0.5	0	-0.001	0.001
$x_3 = 0.5$	0.2	0.5	0	-0.001	0.001
$x_4 = 0.5$	0.1	0.5	0	0.001	-0.002

Global feature importance. Table 1 shows results for the PFI method with the Mean Average Error (MAE) loss function, $mean(CI)$ and $mean|Shapley\ value|$. All methods retrieve the original weights of the linear model but with different accuracy and variance. CI values are identical for all instances in the case of linear models. Therefore, *importance as defined by CI is conceptually identical with global feature importance.* Even though Shapley values estimate instance-level influence it still gives similar values as the other methods but with a high variance, despite a significantly longer execution time.




Fig. 3. Bar plot explanations for linear model and studied instance with different methods. For CIU and Contextual influence the plot is identical on consecutive runs. For Shapley value and LIME the plot changes on every run due to their variance.

Instance-specific results. We study the instance $x = 0.5, 0.5, 0.5, 0.5$ with $f(x) = 0.5$ for which ϕ_i values are zero by definition. Table 2 shows the CI, CU and ϕ values obtained. Fig. 2 shows the same values and their variance over 50 runs for all the methods. CIU/Contextual influence has exactly zero variance. Shapley values and LIME have a great variance, so for the studied instance even the sign of ϕ_i values will change randomly from one explanation to the next. This signifies that the Shapley value and LIME plots in Fig. 3 are misleading. Furthermore,

the influence-based explanations don’t provide hardly any information, whereas the CIU plot does provide useful information about the model and the result.

The CIU plot in Fig. 3 illustrates how CI and CU can be combined into a more information-rich explanation than with influence alone. The length of the half-transparent bar corresponds to the CI value and shows how much modifying the value of the feature would modify the output. The solid bar illustrates the CU value so that a $CU = 1$ value will cover the transparent bar entirely, while $CU = 0$ gives a zero-length solid bar. Therefore, the solid bar shows “how good” the current value is compared with the worst and best possible values for the feature. CI and CU values can be visualised in many ways but the current one has been selected for its “counterfactual” aspect, which signifies that it indicates which features would have the greatest potential for improving the output utility. Such functionality is useful for instance if getting a negative credit decision and seeing what criteria could have the greatest effect if it would be possible to improve the values of those criteria.

4.2 Known Non-linear Function

In order to study the behaviour with a known, non-linear function we use the function in Equation 11. It is worth noting that all features are independent in this function. A Stochastic Gradient Boosting model was trained with a similar training data as for the linear function, *i.e.* 194481 instances and achieved $R^2 = 0.992$.

$$f(x) = 0.7x_1 \sin(10x_1) + 0.3x_2 \sin(10x_2) + x_3^2 + (2x_4^4 - 1.5x_4^2) \quad (11)$$

Table 3. Global importance of input features in percent for the known non-linear function, averaged over 50 iterations. CI and Shapley used 1000 randomly selected instances at each iteration.

Feature	PFI-MAE	CI	Shapley
x_1	30.5 ± 0.0	29.8 ± 0.1	29.4 ± 0.6
x_2	13.0 ± 0.0	11.7 ± 0.0	11.6 ± 0.3
x_3	36.4 ± 0.0	33.3 ± 0.1	39.5 ± 0.6
x_4	20.1 ± 0.0	25.2 ± 0.0	19.6 ± 0.5
<i>Elapsed</i>	<i>1861s.</i>	<i>618s.</i>	<i>35501s.</i>

Global feature importance. Based on the results in Table 3 it seems like all methods agree on the order of importance but it is not possible to say which one is the most “correct” one because they are all based on slightly different definitions

of what global feature importance signifies. In [14] it is claimed that using average importance of all instances provides a better estimate of the global importance than PFI, for instance. That paper uses mean absolute Shapley values. However, as shown in this paper, CI provides a “true” importance measure, rather than the influence values given by Shapley values. CI is orders of magnitude faster than Shapley values and still gives lower variance.

Instance-specific results. We choose to study the instance $x = 0.63, 0.63, 0.59, 0.81$ with $f(x) = 0.235$, which is close to the average $f(x)$ value and therefore gives low expected ϕ_i values. Fig. 2 shows that Contextual influence has close to zero variance, which is therefore true also for CI and CU. Influence-based methods all give close to zero ϕ_i values, resulting in explanations with a low information value, as shown in Fig. 4. The great variance of Shapley values may again cause the signs of ϕ_i to change from one run to the other, which is true also for LIME.

Table 4. Local importance, utility and influence values given by different methods for the known non-linear function, averaged over 50 iterations.

Feature	CI	CU	ϕ_{CIU}	$\phi_{Shapley}$	ϕ_{LIME}
$x_1 = 0.63$	0.300	0.416	-0.025	-0.031	-0.049
$x_2 = 0.63$	0.128	0.416	-0.011	-0.015	-0.021
$x_3 = 0.59$	0.321	0.348	-0.049	0.011	0.095
$x_4 = 0.81$	0.251	0.202	-0.075	-0.040	0.216




Fig. 4. Bar plot explanations for non-linear model and studied instance with different methods. For CIU and Contextual influence the plot is identical on consecutive runs. For Shapley value and LIME the plot changes on every run due to their variance.

4.3 Titanic




Fig. 5. Bar plot explanations of 63.6% survival probability of 8-year old boy ‘Johnny D’ on Titanic with different methods.

The Titanic data set is a classification task with classes ‘yes’ or ‘no’ for the probability of survival. The data set has 2179 instances. We used a Random Forest model that achieved 81.1% classification accuracy on the test set, which was 25% of the whole data set.

Table 5. Global importance of input features for Titanic data set, averaged over 50 iterations. CI and Shapley used 500 randomly selected instances at each iteration.

Feature	PFI-CE	CI	Shapley
Gender	0.244 ± 0.003	0.236 ± 0.005	0.479 ± 0.013
Class	0.163 ± 0.002	0.254 ± 0.004	0.185 ± 0.013
Age	0.157 ± 0.002	0.227 ± 0.003	0.142 ± 0.010
Fare	0.152 ± 0.002	0.156 ± 0.001	0.107 ± 0.007
Embarked	0.098 ± 0.001	0.059 ± 0.001	0.038 ± 0.003
Sibsp	0.096 ± 0.000	0.038 ± 0.002	0.033 ± 0.003
Parch	0.089 ± 0.000	0.029 ± 0.001	0.017 ± 0.002
<i>Elapsed</i>	<i>203s.</i>	<i>6463s.</i>	<i>15009s.</i>

Global feature importance. The class error (CE) loss function was used for PFI. Table 5 shows that all methods agree on the order of feature importance, even

though the least important features get lower importance estimates with CI and Shapley than with the global importance method. The importance value 0.479 given by Shapley values to the ‘gender’ feature seems surprisingly high compared to the other methods. CI again has significantly lower variance than Shapley values and is faster.

Table 6. Local importance/influence/utility estimations for Titanic instance ‘Johnny D’, averaged over 50 iterations.

Feature	CI	CU	ϕ_{CIU}	$\phi_{Shapley}$	ϕ_{LIME}
Gender	0.334	0	-0.334	-0.070	-0.419
Age	0.637	0.899	0.508	0.749	0.203
Class	0.212	0.698	0.084	0.116	0.030
Fare	0.210	0.373	-0.060	-0.056	0.090
Embarked	0.074	1	0.074	0.015	0.096
Sibsp	0.256	0.992	0.252	0.011	0.006
Parch	0.244	0	-0.244	-0.011	0.023

Instance-specific results. The studied instance is “Johnny D”, an 8-year old boy from the Titanic that is also used and analyzed in [2]. Feature values and explanations by the different methods are shown as bar plots in Fig. 5 for the probability of survival, which is 63.6%. For Johnny D, the feature “age” has a clearly higher CI value than the global CI, which is normal because in the context of an 8-year old child the age is the most important feature, as shown by the input-output graph in Fig. 1. Fig. 2 again shows that Contextual influence has close to zero variance. Shapley values and LIME again show great variance and seem to over-emphasize “age” (Shapley) and “gender” (LIME).

4.4 Adult data set

The Adult data set classifies people into the classes of yearly income in US dollars of “ $\leq 50K$ ” and “ $> 50K$ ”. A Stochastic Gradient Boosting model achieved 86.2% classification accuracy on the test set. The test set contained 25% of the whole data set. This data set is mainly included in order to validate the results with another “real-life” data set that has a greater number of features than Titanic. The Adult data set has 30162 instances, which is an order of magnitude more than for Titanic.

Global feature importance. Table 7 shows similar results as for Titanic. CI gives a much higher importance to “capital gain” and “capital loss” features, which can be understood when studying the input-output graphs for those features

Table 7. Global importance of input features in percent for Adult data set, averaged over 50 iterations. CI and Shapley used 500 randomly selected instances at each iteration.

Feature	PFI-CE	CI	Shapley
marital_status	10.0 ± 0.0	10.4 ± 0.2	22.7 ± 0.7
capital_gain	9.9 ± 0.0	29.9 ± 0.7	14.0 ± 1.2
education	8.9 ± 0.0	12.0 ± 0.2	17.8 ± 0.7
age	8.5 ± 0.0	7.8 ± 0.2	12.2 ± 0.5
occupation	8.3 ± 0.0	7.3 ± 0.2	12.8 ± 0.4
capital_loss	8.2 ± 0.0	17.2 ± 0.2	5.0 ± 0.5
hours_per_week	7.8 ± 0.0	5.8 ± 0.1	7.7 ± 0.3
relationship	7.7 ± 0.0	3.3 ± 0.1	2.4 ± 0.2
workclass	7.7 ± 0.0	2.3 ± 0.1	2.2 ± 0.2
sex	7.6 ± 0.0	1.5 ± 0.0	2.7 ± 0.2
native_country	7.6 ± 0.0	2.5 ± 0.1	0.5 ± 0.1
race	7.6 ± 0.0	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0 ± 0.0
<i>Elapsed</i>	<i>1291s.</i>	<i>3314s.</i>	<i>25111s.</i>

and realizing that good values for either one of those features greatly increases the probability of the class “> 50K” (see Fig. 1 for “capital_gain” of the studied instance). Shapley values give a high importance to “marital status” that is difficult to explain.

Instance-specific results. The studied instance has a 86.3% probability of belonging to the class “> 50K”. This particular instance has been chosen because the value “age = 27” is unusual for a person that belongs to the class “> 50K” and where the value for feature “capital_gain” is among the best possible and therefore makes this feature the most important/influential one. The high importance/influence of “capital_gain” is shown by CIU, Contextual influence and Shapley value in Fig. 6, whereas LIME shows radically different results. The Shapley values of many features are very close to zero, so it seems like the most influential features are over-emphasized in the same way as the “age” feature for the Titanic data set. Fig. 2 again confirms the differences in variance between the methods.

5 Conclusions

As illustrated by the barplot “explanations” in Fig. 3, Fig. 4, Fig. 5 and Fig. 6 CI and CU values can provide a kind of counterfactual “what-if?” explanations that show what features have the greatest potential to change the outcome, while also providing an indication of what features have values that could be improved. Such information is missing in the influence-based explanations, which only indicate positive or negative influence compared with a reference value.

Table 8. Local importance/influence/utility estimations for Adult instance, averaged over 50 iterations.

Feature	CI	CU	ϕ_{CIU}	$\phi_{Shapley}$	ϕ_{LIME}
age	0.384	0.944	0.341	0.117	0.021
workclass	0.090	0.774	0.049	0.026	0.005
education	0.433	0.987	0.421	0.224	0.084
marital_stat.	0.520	1.000	0.520	0.272	0.164
occupation	0.320	1.000	0.320	0.125	0.049
relationship	0.157	1.000	0.157	0.107	0.058
race	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.001
sex	0.028	0.000	-0.028	-0.029	-0.030
capital_gain	0.241	0.218	-0.118	-0.012	-0.180
capital_loss	0.241	0.302	-0.088	-0.004	-0.014
hours_per_w.	0.160	0.632	0.042	0.000	-0.075
native_count.	0.060	0.794	0.035	0.003	0.018




Fig. 6. Bar plot explanations of 86.5% probability of belonging to the class “> 50K” with different methods.

CI, CU and Contextual influence have known ranges and can therefore be interpreted directly. $CI = 1$ signifies that the output can be modified completely by modifying the feature value and $CI = 0$ signifies “no importance”, so no effect on the output. $CU = 1$ signifies that the input value(s) are the best possible for obtaining a high-utility output value and $CU = 0$ signifies the worst possible input value(s). The value range for Contextual influence is $[-\phi_0, -\phi_0 + 1]$, so Contextual influence can also be interpreted directly. Shapley value and LIME don’t have such pre-defined ranges, which may lead to misinterpretations of ϕ values, especially when ϕ values are close to zero.

CIU (and therefore also Contextual influence) values have no or small variance in the experimental results, whereas Shapley value and LIME show considerable variance on consecutive runs for the same instance. Therefore, CIU and Contextual influence explanations remain identical over consecutive runs, whereas the Shapley value and LIME results change from one run to the next. Such variance is a challenge for the trustworthiness of the explanations produced by Shapley value and LIME and could be a major problem in real-world use cases, such as explaining credit worthiness assessments given by AI systems.

Contextual importance corresponds to the intuitive and common definition of importance used in decision theory, at least for linear models, and can therefore be generalised to global feature importance. This is not the case for influence values (ϕ) that change for every instance x even in the linear case. Therefore it seems reasonable to use CI for estimating global importance also in the non-linear case, rather than using $mean(|\phi|)$ values.

The theory and results suggest that CIU could provide more informative and stable explanations than the studied mainstream methods. This paper focuses on so called “tabular data” data sets but there’s no reason for why CIU wouldn’t be applicable to other kinds of data, such as images, text *etc.*, which have been extensively studied for Shapley value and LIME.

References

1. Andrews, R., Diederich, J., Tickle, A.B.: Survey and critique of techniques for extracting rules from trained artificial neural networks. *Know.-Based Syst.* **8**(6), 373–389 (Dec 1995)
2. Biecek, P., Burzykowski, T.: *Explanatory Model Analysis*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, New York (2021)
3. Breiman, L.: Random forests. *Machine Learning* **45**, 5–32 (10 2001)
4. Dyer, J.S.: *Maut — Multiattribute Utility Theory*, pp. 265–292. Springer New York, New York, NY (2005)
5. Fishburn, P.C.: *Utility Theory and Decision Theory*, pp. 303–312. Palgrave Macmillan UK, London (1990)
6. Fisher, A., Rudin, C., Dominici, F.: All models are wrong, but many are useful: Learning a variable’s importance by studying an entire class of prediction models simultaneously. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **20**(177), 1–81 (2019)
7. Främling, K.: Explaining results of neural networks by contextual importance and utility. In: Andrews, R., Diederich, J. (eds.) *Rules and networks: Proceedings of the Rule Extraction from Trained Artificial Neural Networks Workshop, AISB’96 conference*. Brighton, UK (1-2 April 1996)
8. Främling, K.: *Modélisation et apprentissage des préférences par réseaux de neurones pour l’aide à la décision multicritère*. Phd thesis, INSA de Lyon (Mar 1996)
9. Främling, K.: Decision theory meets explainable AI. In: Calvaresi, D., Najjar, A., Winikoff, M., Främling, K. (eds.) *Explainable, Transparent Autonomous Agents and Multi-Agent Systems*. pp. 57–74. Springer International Publishing, Cham (2020)
10. Främling, K.: Contextual importance and utility in R: the ‘ciu’ package. In: *Proceedings of 1st Workshop on Explainable Agency in Artificial Intelligence, at 35th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, February 2-9, 2021*. pp. 110–114 (2021)
11. Keeney, R.L., Raiffa, H.: *Decisions with Multiple Objectives: Preferences and Value Trade-Offs*. Cambridge University Press (1993)
12. Kuhn, M.: Building predictive models in R using the caret package. *Journal of Statistical Software, Articles* **28**(5), 1–26 (2008)
13. Kumar, I.E., Venkatasubramanian, S., Scheidegger, C., Friedler, S.: Problems with shapley-value-based explanations as feature importance measures. In: *International Conference on Machine Learning*. pp. 5491–5500. PMLR (2020)
14. Lundberg, S.M., Erion, G.G., Lee, S.I.: Consistent individualized feature attribution for tree ensembles. *CoRR* **abs/1802.03888** (2018)
15. Lundberg, S.M., Lee, S.I.: A unified approach to interpreting model predictions. In: Guyon, I., Luxburg, U.V., Bengio, S., Wallach, H., Fergus, R., Vishwanathan, S., Garnett, R. (eds.) *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30*, pp. 4765–4774. Curran Associates, Inc. (2017)
16. Molnar, C., Casalicchio, G., Bischl, B.: *iml: An R package for Interpretable Machine Learning*. *J. Open Source Softw.* **3**(26), 786 (2018)
17. Pedersen, T.L., Benesty, M.: *lime: Local Interpretable Model-Agnostic Explanations* (2019), R package version 0.5.1
18. Ribeiro, M.T., Singh, S., Guestrin, C.: ”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*. pp. 1135–1144 (2016)
19. Shapley, L.S.: A value for n-person games. In: Kuhn, H.W., Tucker, A.W. (eds.) *Contributions to the Theory of Games II*, pp. 307–317. Princeton University Press, Princeton (1953)

20. Shortliffe, E.H., Davis, R., Axline, S.G., Buchanan, B.G., Green, C., Cohen, S.N.: Computer-based consultations in clinical therapeutics: Explanation and rule acquisition capabilities of the mycin system. *Computers and Biomedical Research* **8**(4), 303 – 320 (1975)
21. Štrumbelj, E., Kononenko, I.: Explaining prediction models and individual predictions with feature contributions. *Knowl. Inf. Syst.* **41**(3), 647–665 (Dec 2014)