
NAVIGATING SHORTCUTS, SPURIOUS CORRELATIONS, AND CONFOUNDERS: FROM ORIGINS VIA DETECTION TO MITIGATION

David Steinmann^{1,2} Felix Divo¹ Maurice Kraus¹ Antonia Wüst¹
Lukas Struppek^{1,3} Felix Friedrich^{1,2} Kristian Kersting^{1,2,3,4}

¹AI & ML Group, TU Darmstadt ²Hessian Center for AI (hessian.AI)
³German Research Center for AI (DFKI) ⁴Centre for Cognitive Science, TU Darmstadt
david.steinmann@tu-darmstadt.de

December 9, 2024

ABSTRACT

Shortcuts, also described as Clever Hans behavior, spurious correlations, or confounders, present a significant challenge in machine learning and AI, critically affecting model generalization and robustness. Research in this area, however, remains fragmented across various terminologies, hindering the progress of the field as a whole. Consequently, we introduce a unifying taxonomy of shortcut learning by providing a formal definition of shortcuts and bridging the diverse terms used in the literature. In doing so, we further establish important connections between shortcuts and related fields, including bias, causality, and security, where parallels exist but are rarely discussed. Our taxonomy organizes existing approaches for shortcut detection and mitigation, providing a comprehensive overview of the current state of the field and revealing underexplored areas and open challenges. Moreover, we compile and classify datasets tailored to study shortcut learning. Altogether, this work provides a holistic perspective to deepen understanding and drive the development of more effective strategies for addressing shortcuts in machine learning.

1 Introduction

Deep learning (DL) has achieved remarkable advancements in recent years, with state-of-the-art models demonstrating superhuman performance in games like chess [167] and Go [166] as well as versatile language systems capable of addressing diverse tasks in zero- or few-shot settings [135; 181]. Despite these impressive achievements, DL models often rely on *shortcuts*, leading to unexpected failures when applied in real-world settings [60].

Overreliance on specific training artifacts can cause these failures, as they do not generalize to data without these artifacts anymore. This phenomenon can take various forms and occur in many settings: In medical applications such as diagnosing pneumonia or dementia, models have been shown to depend on irrelevant factors like hospital identifiers or image quality rather than medically significant features [215; 26]. Image classification models have mistakenly relied on embedded photographer tags [94] or struggled to identify animals in unusual environments [19]. Models predicting product quality from sensor data in sheet metal manufacturing prioritized irrelevant production speed instead of critical applied forces [88]. For sentiment classification, models have used superficial cues such as stop-word distributions instead of focusing on semantically meaningful content [110]. Even large language models (LLMs) have been found to rely on undesired biases from the input data, negatively impacting their fairness [212; 58]. To discuss the underlying issue in more detail, let us introduce a running example that will serve as a reference throughout this work¹:

¹This example follows the waterbird dataset by Sagawa et al. [150].




Figure 1: **Models across different settings are susceptible to shortcuts.** Models trained on data containing **spurious** correlations may rely on unintended features for decision-making. These shortcuts can manifest across various domains and tasks, significantly affecting model performance and generalization.

Running Example: Classifying Birds into Landbirds and Waterbirds

For this illustrative example, let us assume that we have a dataset of images depicting various bird species. The goal is to classify these images into two categories: **landbirds** and **waterbirds**, based on the birds' characteristics. Naturally, images of landbirds are more likely to feature land backgrounds, while images of waterbirds often include water in the background. However, we want the model to perform its predictions based on the bird itself rather than the environment, as the presence of a landbird in front of a water background does not transform it into a waterbird.

When training a model on this waterbird and landbird dataset, it often relies on background features rather than focusing on the birds' relevant characteristics [150]. Similar to the examples discussed earlier, the model follows a shortcut to complete its task. Using the background information can yield high training accuracy, but does not solve the task based on the right reasons. Consequently, the model struggles to generalize to new data where the shortcut is absent, such as landbirds pictured against a water background (cf. Fig. 1, left).

This approach to solving tasks is a well-known phenomenon that extends beyond machine learning, appearing, for instance, in animal psychology [153]. In the context of machine learning, it is described using various different terms: **shortcuts** [61; 57; 125], **spurious correlations** [210; 150; 199], **Clever Hans behaviour** [94; 36; 10], or **confounders** [160; 223; 214]. While these terms describe the same fundamental issue, they are often used informally and lack precise definitions, making it challenging to discern their similarities and differences. Moreover, research on the same problem has been independently developed under these different terms, resulting in a fragmented state of the field with many individual research threads. The absence of comprehensive surveys exacerbates this fragmentation, making it challenging for researchers to gain a clear understanding of the field's current state or to find synergies between methods.

In this work, we take a decisive step toward addressing these issues by introducing a clear and formal definition of the underlying fundamental problem centered around the concepts of **shortcuts** and **spurious correlations**. We then clarify how this definition relates to other terms like **Clever Hans behavior**, **confounders** or **biases**. Going even one step further, we discuss the connection and overlap between shortcuts and other prominent topics in machine learning, including distribution shifts, causality, or adversarial features. In this light, we explore potential sources of shortcuts in machine learning and why models are prone to using them. Given these building blocks, we introduce a taxonomy of shortcut learning, categorizing the rich body of work in this area and bringing research under the various associated terms together. To further facilitate the field's progression, we collect datasets targeting shortcut detection and mitigation and point out open challenges and further research opportunities.

Overall, the contributions of this work can be summarized as follows:

Task: Classify "Landbirds" and "Waterbirds"




Figure 2: **Overview where spurious correlations can appear.** Given our established example of classifying birds into landbirds and waterbirds (based on their characteristics), the environment is a spurious feature naturally occurring in the world (i). The distorted (\rightsquigarrow) sampling process can then induce spurious correlations through, for example, photographer tags (ii).

- (i) We provide formal definitions of shortcuts, unifying and connecting the terms spurious correlations, Clever Hans behavior, and confounders.
- (ii) We introduce a taxonomy of shortcut learning - providing an overview of the current state of the field and structuring existing approaches.
- (iii) Based on this taxonomy, we identify open challenges, like tackling more complex shortcuts, also beyond the typical image classification, that still need to be addressed.
- (iv) We provide a comprehensive overview of available datasets that explicitly include shortcuts, facilitating the development of new approaches.

The structure of the paper is as follows. In Sec. 2, we provide a formal definition of shortcuts and explore their origins. Next, we establish the building blocks of our taxonomy in Sec. 3 and present the taxonomy itself in Sec. 4. In Sec. 5, we discuss methods aimed at detecting shortcuts, followed by methods aimed at mitigating these in Sec. 6. We then collect and review relevant datasets for detection and mitigation in Sec. 7. The paper concludes with a discussion of open challenges in Sec. 8 and a summary in Sec. 9.

2 Shortcuts and their Origin

To establish a foundation for our taxonomy, we first provide a formal definition of shortcuts in the context of machine learning. Following this, we identify under which circumstances they tend to emerge. We start with establishing a common notation of data, features and correlations as a basis for the definitions.

Data. Let us assume there is a ground-truth distribution of observational data $P_{gt}(x)$. The samples from the ground-truth $x \sim P_{gt}(x)$ consist of multiple features from a joint feature set $F = \{f_i\}_{i=1}^M$, such as raw pixels or higher-level attributes like the wing color of a bird. Unfortunately, this ideal distribution is not available in practice. Instead, one can merely observe a distorted view $P(x) \rightsquigarrow P_{gt}(x)$ of the ground truth. A specific dataset $D = \{x_i\}_{i=1}^N$ available for a machine learning task then consists of samples $x_i \sim P(x)$. Importantly, the sampling process follows the distorted distribution $P(x)$ instead of $P_{gt}(x)$. In the following, we assume that there are no errors introduced in sampling from $P(x)$ and potential *sampling errors* occur due to the difference between $P(x)$ and $P_{gt}(x)$.

Features and Correlations. Assume we have such a dataset D and a specific task $T : F_{input} \rightarrow F_{target}$, mapping from an input set $F_{input} \subseteq F$ to a target set $F_{target} \subseteq F$ of features, where $F_{input} \cap F_{target} = \emptyset$. We model correlations between features in the dataset through a symmetric correlation function $c : F \times F \rightarrow [0, 1]$, indicating that two features f_i and f_j are more correlated if $c(f_i, f_j)$ is closer to 1. Within the context of machine learning, we are specifically interested in correlations related to the task, i.e., correlations between $f_i \in F_{input}$ and $f_j \in F_{target}$. There are different ways to measure whether two features are correlated. The most common one is the Pearson correlation coefficient [157] for linear relationships, but others like Spearman’s [128] or Kendall’s [1] rank correlation coefficient can also be used. In the following, if the specific type of correlation is relevant, it is specifically mentioned.

Spurious Correlations and Shortcuts. Given task T , some input features are considered relevant to solve the task (in the intended way), which we denote as $F_{relevant} \subseteq F_{input}$. Correlations $c(f_i, f_j)$ between non-relevant $f_i \notin F_{relevant}$ and

target $f_j \in F_{\text{target}}$ are considered *spurious*. There are two main reasons for spurious correlations to occur. First (cf. (i) in Fig. 2), the correlation given task T may already be spurious in the ground-truth distribution of observations P_{gt} . We call such correlations *world-induced*. An example is the environment when classifying waterbirds and landbirds. Waterbirds appear statistically more often on water than landbirds, even in the ground-truth world. As we have established, we want to perform the classification based on the bird’s characteristics and not based on the environment. Thus, the correlation between background and landbird/waterbird (originating from $P_{\text{gt}}(x)$) is spurious. The second reason (cf. (ii) in Fig. 2) why a correlation $c(f_i, f_j)$ can be spurious originates from the difference between $P_{\text{gt}}(x)$ and $P(x)$. This so-called *sampling-induced* distortion of the observational data can induce new correlations through, for example, selection bias. For instance, imagine that in $P(x)$, we only have images of waterbirds with a photographer’s signature in D , whereas no signatures exist in landbird samples. Then, the correlation between the signature and the waterbird/landbird label is an induced spurious correlation. A *shortcut* appears when a model uses a spurious correlation as the basis for its decision-making, i.e., relies on spurious instead of relevant features. Both types of spurious correlations, naturally occurring and induced through the distorted sampling process, enable shortcuts.

2.1 World-Induced Shortcuts

The world is full of correlations, and determining which are relevant and which are spurious can be challenging [168]. In our example of distinguishing landbirds from waterbirds, we established that the correlation between the bird’s habitat (background) and the landbird/waterbird classification is spurious and that a model should focus on the bird’s characteristics instead. This approach assumes that we want the model to classify the bird type based on its features. Alternatively, we might want the model to make this decision based on the bird’s habitat rather than the bird’s features. In that case, the background features are relevant, while the correlation between bird features and the target would be spurious. We call these spurious correlations **world-induced**.

While, general world knowledge can aid to distinguish between relevant and spurious features, considering the specific task remains important, as it directly influences which features and correlations are relevant [122]. This origin of shortcuts, i.e., naturally occurring but unwanted correlations, is sometimes also called *world bias* [176].

2.2 Sampling-Induced Shortcuts

When using a dataset for machine learning, it *never* represents the ground-truth world distribution $P_{\text{gt}}(x)$ precisely. As a result, datasets may contain correlations that do not exist in the ground-truth distribution, which we refer to as *sampling-induced* arising from the distorted sampling process. Generally, these induced correlations are spurious since they do not reflect causal relationships but occur due to errors in the data collection. In the machine learning datasets, such errors can, for example, occur due to careless data scraping [198; 21; 193], particularly in large-scale, automatically scraped web datasets.

At a high level, all sampling-induced spurious correlations can be traced back to *selection bias* [196], where the sampling process does not draw samples completely random from the ground-truth distribution. More specifically, errors may arise from over- or underrepresenting specific relationships between features in the data due to sampling bias [120] or representation bias [98]. Moreover, measurement errors can induce other unintended correlations, often referred to as measurement bias [176].

Most of the time, these induced spurious correlations are not intentionally included in the data, which we refer to as *accidental* spurious correlations. Conversely, it is also possible that shortcuts in datasets are intentional. From an adversarial perspective, dataset manipulations known as data poisoning [17] may introduce spurious correlations that are not present in the ground-truth distribution. In addition to data poisoning, there are benign, intentionally induced shortcuts. Model watermarking [4; 23] is one such application, used to mark model ownership or to link generated content to a specific source [54; 83]. Another benign appearance of induced spurious correlations involves research datasets specifically designed to evaluate an algorithm’s robustness to such correlations (cf. Sec. 7).

2.3 Why Do Models Learn Shortcuts?

In most cases, spurious correlations exist alongside relevant correlations in the data. In these cases, it is theoretically possible for models to rely only on the relevant features instead of the shortcuts. However, models frequently end up using these shortcuts [140]. So, why does this happen?

First of all, a model’s task is generally not precisely defined [15]. For example, whether it’s a coarse label image classification or next-token prediction in language models, ML models are typically trained using empirical risk minimization (ERM) on proxy tasks optimized through loss-based optimization. These task formulations do not prevent models from using shortcuts. For instance, if a model is trained to distinguish waterbirds from landbirds, it receives only images and labels without explicit information about what defines each bird type. The broad task definitions do not specify how the task should be solved, thus enabling the model to rely on shortcuts rather than relevant features.

Table 1: Overview of existing surveys in the field

Survey	Area	Focus	Definition	Origin	Detection	Mitigation
Friedrich et al. [57]	Vision	Shortcut	✗	✗	✗	✓
Gupta et al. [66]	Vision	Confounder	✗	✗	✗	✓
Banerjee et al. [16]	Med. Imaging	Shortcut	✗	✓	✓	✓
Dogra et al. [48]	Language	Shortcut	✗	✓	✓	✓
Ho et al. [71]	Language	Shortcut	✗	✗	✓	✓
Geirhos et al. [60]	General	Shortcut	✓	✓	✗	✗
Ye et al. [210]	General	Spurious Correlation	✓	✓	✗	✓
Ours	General	Shortcut, Confounder, Spurious Correlation, Clever Hans	✓	✓	✓	✓

It should be noted that while ML relies mostly on these coarse tasks, defining more specific tasks and obtaining the necessary data is a challenge in itself.

But why do models often seem to favor learning shortcuts over relevant features? One explanation is given by Occam’s Razor or simplicity bias [210]. If it is easier to learn the shortcut than the relevant correlations, ERM tends to learn the shortcut [140]. Interestingly, depending on the nature of the dataset and the task, this can even occur when the spurious correlation is not inherently easier to learn [129]. Furthermore, models tend to learn shortcuts if the noise in the relevant features is larger than the noise in the spurious features [209; 140]. This essentially means that in the given data, the shortcut can be more predictive to solve the task than the relevant features. Overparameterized models are even more susceptible to this tendency, as they may memorize training samples without the shortcut rather than learning relevant features effectively [152].

3 Establishing the Building Blocks of our Taxonomy

Although the concept of shortcuts has been known for a long time, it has never been studied from a wholesome perspective. In addition to inconsistent terminology, most work has been very problem-focused or task-specific. However, shortcuts are an important problem that must be tackled from a general perspective. Hence, we establish the first taxonomy of shortcut learning, a detailed overview of the topic to help the research community advance shortcut learning. In the following, we begin with an overview of related work before establishing connections between shortcuts and other machine-learning areas. By integrating these perspectives, we lay the foundation for a unified taxonomy in the next section.

3.1 Related Work

While there are numerous works introducing methods to detect or mitigate shortcuts, only a handful of surveys exists Tab. 1. From these, none covers shortcut learning in a comprehensive way. The existing surveys mostly focus on specific areas: vision [57; 66], medical images [16] or language [48; 71] and only focus on work under a specific term: shortcut [57; 16; 48; 71; 61], spurious correlation [210] or confounder [66]. While these surveys provide a valuable resource in their specific setting, neither is suitable as a general overview over the field of shortcut learning. To bridge this gap, our work does not confine itself to specific target areas and does not focus on specific terms. Instead our introduced taxonomy provides for the first time a general and unifying view on shortcut learning.

Beyond the lack of comprehensive surveys, the terms *shortcut*, *spurious correlation* and *Clever Hans behavior* are generally used informally. To unify the field and understand the differences between individual terms and works, a formal definition is essential. Our definition bases on the description of shortcuts by Geirhos et al. [60], which describes a shortcut as an unintended solution that still performs well on the training data, so essentially a solution that relies on unintended features. While this captures the essence of shortcuts quite well, it is insufficient to discuss all different terms. Thus, our given definition explicitly covers the origins of shortcuts, relating them with spurious correlations. Further, the more detailed formulization also captures the relation between shortcuts and confounders (cf. Sec. 3.3 below).

The most formalized definition of spurious correlations in the field comes from Ye et al. [210]. They define a correlation as spurious if it is between a non-predictive input feature and a target feature. While their approach reflects the perspective of group-robustness optimization [150], it does not cover all instances of spurious correlations; there can also be spurious correlations with a correlation coefficient of one. The strength of the correlation should not determine whether it is spurious or not. In contrast, our definition explicitly covers the origin of spurious correlations and the




Figure 3: **Overview of the waterbirds example in the context of causality.** In the data, we have access to the bird’s characteristics and its environment and we want to predict whether the bird is a landbird or waterbird. If we assume that the bird’s characteristics (i.e., its appearance and abilities) cause both its environment and whether it is a waterbird, environment and the target label are correlated in the data (while not causally related). The common cause (bird characteristics) is called a confounder.

resulting shortcuts in the model, thus unifying the concepts of spurious correlations and shortcuts. To further establish the fundamentals of our taxonomy, we now connect shortcuts and spurious correlations to the remaining building blocks.

3.2 From Animal Psychology to Machine Learning: The Clever Hans Phenomenon

The term *Clever Hans* originates from animal psychology, named after the famous horse Hans that apparently had learned to understand human language [153]. After careful examination, it turned out that Hans learned to rely on the subtle facial expressions of the humans asking the questions and was unable to answer when not seeing the human face. To solve its task, the facial expressions were shortcuts, which Hans learned to utilize.

Based on this story, the term *Clever Hans* has also been adopted outside of animal psychology to describe the usage of unintended cues to solve a task. In the context of machine learning, this corresponds to models learning to rely on shortcuts in the training data instead of the relevant features [94]. Clever Hans behavior has been shown to occur in various tasks, e.g., in classification [169] or anomaly detection [80]. While Clever Hans behavior is seldomly formalized, it corresponds to our definition of a shortcut.

3.3 Shortcuts and Confounders from a Causality Perspective

Spurious correlations and shortcuts are inherently connected to the field of causality. One of the most general definitions of a spurious correlation is "a correlation which does not imply causation", which is relevant in causality because it affects learning about genuine causal effects [136]. In the context of causality, the term *confounder* appears regularly as well. To explain how these terms are connected, let us again consider the waterbird example (Fig. 3). In this context, we have only talked about spurious correlations and intended correlations so far, but we have not talked about actual causal relationships. Let us assume that a bird’s characteristics, i.e., its appearance and abilities, cause both its environment (as they influence where a bird usually lives) and whether it is considered a landbird or waterbird. In this case, the bird’s characteristics are a confounder: As they cause both the environment and the target label, they are the source of the spurious correlation between both.

We note that while most machine learning mainly considers identifying correlations and does not model explicit causal relations, this causal perspective can provide valuable insights regarding the origin of spurious correlations. Particularly world-induced spurious correlations can originate from observed or hidden confounders. Moreover, avoiding and addressing confounders is necessary for estimating causal effects, which has a long history in causal inference [121] and epidemiology [124]. Thus, causal analysis can provide powerful tools to detect and mitigate confounders and the resulting spurious correlations.

Moreover, the problem of shortcuts can even go beyond confounders in causality. Consider a simple causal graph with three variables: $A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C$. If the relation $B \rightarrow C$ is a simple linear correlation, we can predict B from C . While this can serve as a reasonable correlation basis for predictions in most cases, using C as a basis to predict B is not reliable when B is intervened on. Similarly, it would be possible to predict C from A , which again is not reliable if B is intervened on. So, while addressing confounders is a helpful tool in combatting spurious correlations, it is not necessarily sufficient to mitigate all potential shortcuts.

Finally, it is noteworthy that the term confounders in most ML research is used with a different meaning than the "causal" confounder described above. Some papers rather use "confounder" as a synonym for shortcuts and, in particular, the shortcut features [160; 223; 214]. To keep terminology clear and avoid confusion, we recommend to rather use the term shortcut in these circumstances and refer to the term confounder for its causal meaning.

3.4 The Role of Distribution Shift in Shortcut Learning

When a model has learned a shortcut, it relies on some specific and unintended features to solve its task. This becomes particularly problematic when these features change or are no longer present in the data, as the model then makes incorrect predictions. Distribution shifts can be one of the main reasons why features change, and shortcuts do not work anymore. On the contrary, models that are robust to distribution shifts tend also to be more robust to shortcuts, particularly against sampling-induced ones, as they rely on more robust features [225]. Another way to utilize distribution shifts in the context of shortcut learning is to detect shortcuts. When comparing model performance on the initial data distributions and several shifted versions, potential sources for performance degradation are shortcuts [194]. Overall, the field of shortcut learning can benefit from the research on distribution shifts both to detect potential shortcuts and to develop more robust models, thus mitigating the reliance on shortcuts.

3.5 Bias as a Potential Origin of Shortcuts

The term bias is broadly used in discussions about machine learning models and datasets, particularly regarding fairness [120]. As bias is used in many different contexts and with different meanings, it is difficult to give an exact definition. Informally, however, bias can be described as a model having a tendency toward specific factors, which are often irrelevant or undesired, such as a credit scoring system relying on race or gender. The term also regularly appears in the field of shortcut learning as several works refer to spurious correlations as *dataset biases* (e.g., [81; 158; 206; 142; 111]).

Further, biases are an important reason why spurious correlations occur in datasets. Inducing spurious correlations through a (distorted) sampling process is often known as sampling or selection bias [196], representation bias [98] or measurement bias [176]. We discuss these biases as an origin for shortcuts in detail in Sec. 2.2. However, not all biases stem from the data selection and sampling process. Biases that reflect patterns in the world are often termed historical biases [176] and can be seen as correlations in the ground-truth distribution $P_{\text{gt}}(x)$ that we may not want a model to reflect [101; 70]. Although the reasons for not reflecting these correlations in a model might be different from the reasons described in Sec. 2.1, the differences from a technical perspective are small. This opens the use of shortcut mitigation techniques to address biases, such as mitigating gender bias [222]. While this work primarily focuses on techniques to mitigate shortcuts and spurious correlations, many strategies from bias mitigation can be adapted to this purpose. Vice versa, the methods we present to mitigate shortcuts can also be used to reduce biases in machine learning models and datasets. Consequently, there is a large potential for the fields of shortcut and bias mitigation to benefit from each other.

3.6 Adversarial Features as Shortcuts

Shortcuts are also relevant from an adversarial machine learning perspective, they have a high similarity to backdoor attacks, a common attack on models [64; 33]. Backdoor attacks integrate a hidden functionality into by manipulating the training data. When queried with normal inputs, the backdoored model behaves as expected, however adding the trigger to the data activates the model and it produces specific outputs, for example classifying all images as horses. A common strategy to create a backdoor is adding a small number of poisoned samples to the training set, containing a visual trigger like small colored patches. The label of the poisoned samples is set to the desired target class. After training, inputs containing the trigger are always classified as the target class, regardless of their actual content. In the light of our formalization, we can interpret triggers as adversarial features f_{adv} that are added to the set of input features F_{input} , introducing spurious correlations $c(f_{\text{adv}}, f_{\text{target}})$ with target features. These correlations are induced due to a (adversarially) distorted sampling process and not present in $P_{\text{gt}}(x)$. This highlights that the problem of detection and mitigating spurious correlations and the resulting shortcuts is not only relevant for model performance and generalization, but equally as important to maintain security and privacy [208]. On the other hand, there is a lot of work from the security perspective on detecting and mitigating backdoor attacks. These methods can potentially also be used to detect and mitigate shortcuts, and can be a valuable addition to the field.

4 A Unified Taxonomy of Shortcut Learning

After establishing the building blocks, we can now introduce our unified taxonomy. Within this taxonomy, we integrate concepts and methods from diverse fields under the overarching term of *shortcut learning*. By unifying research under the terms shortcuts, spurious correlations, Clever Hans behavior, and confounder, we provide a structured and comprehensive perspective on the field. The taxonomy structures approaches first into two main categories, which build upon each other: *shortcut detection* and *shortcut mitigation*.

Shortcut Detection. Identifying shortcuts is a critical step in addressing shortcut learning, as mitigating shortcuts first requires an awareness of their presence. Since many mitigation techniques rely on prior knowledge of the shortcuts involved, detection methods are a crucial prerequisite for the mitigation strategies that follow. We categorize




Figure 4: **Overview of our taxonomy on shortcut learning.** We categorize approaches into the two areas of shortcut detection and shortcut mitigation. Detailed information, including all subcategories, is provided in Fig. 5 and Fig. 6 in the following sections.

shortcut detection methods into four main approaches based on their methodology: detection through evaluating model performance and utility, detection via perturbations, detection using model explanations, and detection through causal analysis. A more detailed breakdown of these categories is illustrated in Fig. 5, with an in-depth discussion of each category and its respective methods provided in Sec. 5.

Shortcut Mitigation. Once shortcuts have been identified, the focus shifts to preventing models from relying on them, which is the goal of shortcut mitigation. This problem can be approached at different stages of the machine learning pipeline: When preparing the datasets, at the model itself, or at inference time. Accordingly, we categorize mitigation methods into these three main groups. A comprehensive breakdown of the subcategories is provided in Fig. 6, and the specific techniques within each group are discussed in detail in Sec. 6.

Datasets. While much of the research in shortcut learning focuses on developing methods for detecting and mitigating shortcuts, datasets play a crucial role in advancing and evaluating these approaches. Although shortcuts exist in many, if not most, datasets, their mere presence is not enough to effectively develop and assess detection and mitigation methods. For meaningful progress, datasets must provide detailed information about the shortcuts they contain, enabling controlled and systematic evaluations. To support this, we present a collection of datasets frequently used in shortcut learning in Sec. 7. The datasets are not explicitly listed in the taxonomy overview Fig. 4, as they are implicitly part of shortcut detection and mitigation.

This taxonomy offers a structured overview of the field, serving as a valuable resource for both practitioners and researchers. For practitioners, it compiles methods for shortcut detection and mitigation, facilitating their application in practical settings. For researchers, it provides a comprehensive summary of the current state of the field, shedding light on critical challenges that require further investigation. The following sections explain the two parts of shortcut detection and mitigation in detail.

5 Detection

To address shortcuts in the data, it is first necessary to recognize their presence. As discussed in the previous sections, it is often challenging to decide what features are spurious, as this decision depends on the task and its intended solution. To circumvent this, some methods aim to provide effective tools for domain experts to understand what features a model is relying on and let them decide whether these features are spurious or not. To design automatic detection methods without explicit human interactions, other methods pose some more specific assumptions about the nature of shortcuts in the data, such as the presence of minority groups (i.e., a small number of samples where spurious features are absent). The assumptions of the different methods impact the way how shortcuts can be detected and addressed. Based on existing literature, we have identified four main categories of detection methods: assessing model utility, detecting shortcuts via perturbations, detection using XAI techniques, as well as causality-based methods (cf. Fig. 5).

5.1 Detection via Model Utility

The underlying assumption of the following works is that shortcuts are easier to learn than the relevant features. Additionally, they often assume that there are some samples without the shortcut present. The methods then use these assumptions to detect samples with and without spurious features.

5.1.1 Generalized Cross Entropy. Generalized cross-entropy (GCE) is a specific way to promote the learning of easy-to-learn features. Luo et al. [111] and Nam et al. [130] train an additional detector with a GCE loss to distinguish between easy-to-learn and hard-to-learn samples. With the assumption that shortcuts are easier to learn, this detector can provide pseudo-labels to use for shortcut mitigation.

5.1.2 Simplicity Bias. Yang et al. [206] propose SPARE, which aims to identify shortcuts early in training by leveraging simplicity bias. Their method clusters network outputs from early epochs to separate majority and minority groups, assuming that shortcuts are already learned early during training. This clustering is followed by importance sampling to mitigate these correlations. LaBonte et al. [92] suggest training multiple models with strong regularization techniques such as dropout and early stopping, identifying non-shortcut samples by finding those consistently correctly classified across models. Yenamandra et al. [211] first amplify shortcuts by training with a large weight decay rate, followed by correlation-aware clustering to discover shortcut-conflicting slices of data. This approach is suitable for scenarios where, at most, one spurious attribute exists. Similarly, Dagaev et al. [40] use a low-capacity network to detect easy-to-learn features that are likely to be spurious. These can then be down-weighted during training of a high-capacity network to encourage the focus on relevant features.

5.1.3 Miscellaneous. Adnan et al. [5] detect shortcuts using mutual information between input and learned representations. This involves training an infinite-width model using neural tangent kernels [76] to compute mutual information for both training and out-of-distribution (OOD) test data. If mutual information for the test data is significantly lower than for the training data, it suggests the presence of shortcuts, highlighting correlations that may not generalize well beyond the training distribution. While initially designed to detect backdoor triggers, SCALE-UP [65] could also be used to detect shortcuts. This method analyzes the consistency of predictions when scaling the input data to detect potential irregularities.

5.2 Perturbation-Based Detection.

Perturbation-based detection methods examine how model performance changes when data is systematically modified, revealing any reliance on potential spurious features. In general, we can differentiate between automatic augmentations, semi-automatic generations, and manual approaches.

5.2.1 Manual Perturbations. Several works utilize domain knowledge to craft these perturbations manually. For example, Chettri [36] focus on detecting shortcuts in voice spoofing detection by evaluating a model’s performance on both original and augmented versions of the dataset. The augmented data includes adding or removing artifacts, such as specific audio features that do not correlate with genuine or spoofed labels but may serve as shortcuts. The difference in model performance serves as a coarse detection mechanism for shortcuts. A similar methodology is employed by Sturm [174] in the context of music information retrieval systems. In their work, they propose the “method of irrelevant transformations”, modifying data using changes that should not affect the target variable (e.g., applying slight equalization or cropping irrelevant parts of audio recordings). Changes in model performance reveal dependencies on dataset-specific shortcuts that might be unrelated to actual musical content.

5.2.2 Semi Automated Perturbations. In contrast, Agarwal et al. [6] leverage automated semantic image manipulations to assess model robustness in Visual Question Answering (VQA). By steering the generation process of a generative adversarial network (GAN), they modify certain image features, allowing them to test for model consistency across different versions. Unlike manually crafted augmentations, their use of GANs provides an automated yet




Figure 5: **Taxonomy of shortcut detection approaches.** A comprehensive breakdown of shortcut detection methods, organized into methodological subcategories.

Table 2: Overview of different shortcut detection methods. Methods are sorted based on category and subcategory. More information about the methods is provided in Sec. 5.1–5.4.

	Subcategory	Method	Description
<i>Model Utility</i> (Sec. 5.1)	Simplicity Bias	Yang et al. [206]	Identify shortcuts early during training
	Simplicity Bias	LaBonte et al. [92]	Multiple regularized models as detector ensemble
	Simplicity Bias	Yenamandra et al. [211]	Amplify shortcut detection through weight-decay
	Simplicity Bias	Dagaev et al. [40]	Low-capacity network as shortcut detector
	Generalized CE	Luo et al. [111]	Shortcut detector with GCE loss
	Generalized CE	Nam et al. [130]	Shortcut detector with GCE loss
	Miscellaneous	Adnan et al. [5]	Mutual feature information as shortcut indicator
	Miscellaneous	Guo et al. [65]	Prediction consistency when scaling input features
<i>Perturbation</i> (Sec. 5.2)	Manual	Chettri [36]	Perturbations in voice spoofing detection
	Manual	Sturm [174]	Method of irrelevant transformations
	Semi Automated	Agarwal et al. [6]	Steering semantic automated image manipulations
	Semi Automated	Brown et al. [27]	Perturb encodings of sensitive attributes
	Fully Automated	Wang et al. [189]	Frequency-based perturbations
<i>XAI</i> (Sec. 5.3)	Heatmap Clustering	Lapuschkin et al. [94]	Spectral clustering of LRP explanations
	Heatmap Clustering	Schramowski et al. [155]	Spectral clustering of explanations
	Heatmap Clustering	Moayeri et al. [123]	Heatmaps of adversarially trained networks
	Disentanglement	Chormai et al. [37]	Separate explanations into conceptual concepts
	Disentanglement	Carter et al. [30]	Sufficient Input Subsets for predictions
	Disentanglement	Müller et al. [126]	Disentangle meaningful features via VAE
	Disentanglement	Bykov et al. [29]	Compare functional & concept-based distances
	Disentanglement	Szyc et al. [177]	Salient features within bounding boxes
	Counterfactuals	DeGrave et al. [42]	Counterfactuals for COVID-19 lung images
Counterfactuals	Sikka et al. [165]	Counterfactual-based neuron activations for trojan triggers	
<i>Causal</i> (Sec. 5.4)	Interventional data	Kumar et al. [90]	Estimate causal relationships with interventional data
	Causal Inference	Zheng and Makar [224]	Model data generation to detect shortcuts
	Causal Inference	Karlsson and Krijthe [79]	Identify hidden confounders between multiple environments

contextually informed approach to detecting shortcuts. Brown et al. [27] propose ShorT, which specifically intervenes on model encoding of sensitive attributes (e.g., age or race). By systematically altering these encodings and assessing their impact on model performance and fairness, ShorT identifies whether they act as shortcuts, ensuring fairer AI predictions in medical applications.

5.2.3 Fully Automated Perturbations. Wang et al. [189] provide a fully automatic process to reveal frequency-based shortcuts in networks for image classification. They perturb the data by sequentially removing specific frequency bands to assess their importance. This enables ranking frequencies by their effect on model loss and helps identify whether models over-rely on particular frequency components. They further test model performance with only the top 5% of frequencies, detecting whether neural networks only focus on narrow aspects of the data spectrum, which they deem a likely shortcut.

There also exist other methods related to the detection of shortcuts in the context of adversarial feature detection [203; 59] using intentional adversarial perturbations. By adding a universal adversarial perturbation to an image and comparing the model’s predictions on the perturbed and unperturbed images, these methods can identify backdoors. While some of them need to know the trigger size [202; 139], others need many clean images [107] or multiple trained models [220].

Overall, perturbation-based methods for shortcut detection provide a direct way to explore model behavior under systematically altered data conditions. However, these methods generally require domain expertise to identify relevant perturbations or artifacts, making them highly task-dependent.

5.3 Detection via XAI

Deciding which features are spurious and which are relevant is difficult without domain knowledge, so a suite of methods has been designed to help domain experts identify shortcuts. To analyze the focus of the model, they use common XAI techniques [77]. However, just using existing libraries (e.g., AIX360 [13], XAITK [73], InterpretML [134] or

Captum [87]) to detect shortcuts out of the box remains challenging, particularly for more complex shortcuts. Thus, this section covers methods that facilitate the analysis of model explanations to detect shortcuts.

5.3.1 Heatmap Clustering. Lapuschkin et al. [94]; Schramowski et al. [155] both cluster explanation heatmaps and then present them to a human for evaluation, which is extended to enable automation using context activation vectors (CAV) [10]. Similarly, Moayeri et al. [123] present heatmaps of multiple adversarially trained networks or linear layers (on top of a pretrained encoder) to humans, who then decide whether the identified features are reasonable or not.

5.3.2 Disentanglement. Several works try to disentangle either the explanation or input space to find shortcuts on a discretized level. Chormai et al. [37] aims to separate explanations into components that represent different concepts, while Carter et al. [30] directly compute input subsets that are sufficient for a high-confidence prediction and Müller et al. [126] utilize a VAE to disentangle meaningful features in a given dataset. These methods enable a domain expert to detect potential shortcuts on a higher conceptual level. Furthermore, Bykov et al. [29] identify shortcuts between output representations by comparing functional and concept-based distances using extreme activations and Wu-Palmer metrics from WordNet. Szyk et al. [177] measure how much of the model’s salient features (from the saliency map) fall within a bounding box.

5.3.3 Counterfactual Generation. DeGrave et al. [42] use saliency maps to let radiologists decide if the model focuses on spurious features in lung images, such as laterality markers, arrows, annotations unique to the dataset, and image borders. Then, they generate counterfactuals of different COVID-19 statuses to highlight both relevant and spurious features. By utilizing neuron attributions to identify ghost neurons that exhibit distinct behavior when Trojan triggers are present, Sikka et al. [165] demonstrate how counterfactual-based neuron excitation can reveal accuracy drops, enabling detection of malicious behaviors.

5.4 Causality-Based Detection

Causality-based detection methods aim to estimate causal effects to detect the impact of spurious correlations in machine learning models. These approaches typically leverage knowledge of the data generation process through causal inference techniques to identify the resulting shortcuts.

5.4.1 Interventional Data. For example, Kumar et al. [90] introduce causal effect regularization, which aligns model predictions with estimated causal effects by using interventional distributions to regularize the model. This method assumes the availability of interventional data to estimate causal relationships accurately.

5.4.2 Causal Inference. Zheng and Makar [224] propose a two-step approach that leverages auxiliary labels to identify and remove shortcuts. Their method relies on a causal directed acyclic graph to represent the data generation process, allowing the model to detect shortcuts. Karlsson and Krijthe [79] focus on identifying hidden confounders using data from multiple environments with different levels of confounding. By analyzing conditional independencies across these environments, they detect hidden shortcuts that affect the relationships. This approach assumes a well-understood causal mechanism underlying the data.

Overall, while causality-based methods offer a systematic approach to enhance model robustness by addressing spurious correlations, they often depend on strong assumptions, such as access to interventional data or detailed causal structures, which can limit their practical applicability.

5.5 Open Challenges in Shortcut Detection

The previous overview highlights that many shortcut detection methods still rely, at least partially, on human input. For example, most XAI-based methods aim to refine model explanations, making it easier for humans to identify shortcuts. Similarly, perturbation-based approaches often depend on human effort to select irrelevant features for perturbation.

As discussed in Sec. 2, determining whether a feature is relevant or spurious is inherently complex and particularly challenging without access to commonsense knowledge. Given these challenges, it is natural to involve humans in the final decision regarding the presence of shortcuts. However, as the field progresses, the practicality and scalability of these methods must be considered. While human interaction can offer valuable insights, it is crucial to limit the extent of this involvement, as users are often reluctant to label or validate large numbers of samples [9]. Therefore, a key direction for future research is to maximize the efficiency of human interactions in shortcut detection methods.

Additionally, many detection methods are built on specific assumptions. For instance, utility-based approaches often assume that shortcut features are easier to learn than relevant features. XAI-based methods presume that shortcuts can be revealed through explanation techniques, while causality-based approaches may assume the availability of counterfactual or interventional data. However, these assumptions are rarely made explicit, making it difficult to

assess the true capabilities and limitations of a given method. To address this, future work should state the underlying assumptions more clearly. Moreover, evaluating existing methods in more diverse and comprehensive scenarios to test these assumptions is essential for assessing the current state of the field.

6 Mitigation

The methods discussed in the previous section help to identify whether shortcuts are present in the dataset, but detection alone is not sufficient to mitigate shortcut effects on the model. To address this, a wide range of methods is available. We categorize the methods based on their main level of application (cf. Fig. 6). They can either apply at the dataset level (Sec. 6.1), at the model level (Sec. 6.2) or at inference time (Sec. 6.3). In the following, we cover each area in more detail.

6.1 Mitigation at Dataset Level

The first set of strategies focuses on mitigating shortcuts directly at the dataset level. They aim to remove the underlying spurious correlations, preventing a model from learning them by ensuring they are no longer present. These methods address both sampling-induced and naturally occurring spurious correlations within the dataset. This section covers all methods that directly modify the available data, while approaches like sample reweighting are discussed in later sections.

6.1.1 Data Curation. In real-world machine learning applications like healthcare, datasets typically go through thorough preprocessing steps, including data cleaning and feature selection [68]. By addressing shortcuts during this process, many spurious correlations, whether naturally occurring or introduced through sampling, can be mitigated [8; 138]. However, this process is inherently domain and task-specific, so there is no general method for data curation against shortcuts.

6.1.2 Static Data Augmentation. Beyond careful selection and filtering of the available data, static data augmentation covers approaches that augment the existing dataset prior to training with new samples to break existing spurious correlations [162]. When segmentations of the spurious features for the input images are available, Teso and Kersting [179] and Plumb et al. [137] remove the shortcut by masking these features from the image. One step further, Nauta et al. [132] train GANs to inpaint medical images and remove existing shortcuts. Similar approaches have also been used to remove backdoor triggers by generating synthetic variations of images with diffusion models [173].

Instead of removing the spurious features altogether, a different approach is to create new samples to balance the relationship between target and spurious features, thus removing the spurious correlation. Following this idea, Kwon et al. [91] combine segmented foreground objects and arbitrary image backgrounds to mitigate shortcuts tied to the image background. Noohdani et al. [133] avoid the need for annotations and instead use class-activation mappings (CAM) to obtain foreground and background segmentations. To obtain new samples that are more natural than arbitrary combinations of foregrounds and backgrounds, Mao et al. [118] first generate augmented versions of the original data with GANs, which are then transferred to the original dataset using neural style transfer. Wu et al. [199] perform mixup-based data augmentation utilizing high-level conceptual information about shortcuts to create an augmented dataset with balanced occurrences.

Shortcuts can also be hidden in different input representations, for example, in the frequency domain. Wang et al. [188] show that models utilize frequency shortcuts and utilize data augmentation to mitigate them. They create inputs where important frequencies of random classes are removed to increase the model’s robustness to frequency shortcuts and




Figure 6: **Detailed taxonomy of shortcut mitigation approaches.** An in-depth representation of shortcut mitigation strategies, categorizing methods along their main application level and their mitigation strategy.

Table 3: Overview of different shortcut mitigation methods, sorted by category and subcategory.

	Subcategory	Method	Description
<i>Dataset</i> (Sec. 6.1)	Data Curation	Ahmed et al. [7]	Cleaning shortcuts in Covid-19 Data
	Data Curation	Portal-Diaz et al. [138]	Patch removal in chest X-rays
	Static Data Aug.	Teso and Kersting [179]	Mask shortcuts with noise
	Static Data Aug.	Plumb et al. [137]	Mask shortcut features
	Static Data Aug.	Nauta et al. [132]	Inpaint shortcuts in medical images with GANs
	Static Data Aug.	Kwon et al. [91]	Augment foregrounds with random backgrounds
	Static Data Aug.	Noohdani et al. [133]	Augment CAM foregrounds with random backgrounds
	Static Data Aug.	Mao et al. [118]	Augmented samples with style transfer
	Static Data Aug.	Wu et al. [199]	MixUp-based data augmentation
	Static Data Aug.	Wang et al. [188]	Frequency-based data augmentation
	Static Data Aug.	Wang and Culotta [192]	Augment using language antonyms
	Static Data Aug.	Gowda et al. [63]	Causal bootstrapping
	Adaptive Data Aug.	Seo et al. [158]	Stochastic label noise
	Adaptive Data Aug.	Lee et al. [95]	Random shortcut feature swapping
	Adaptive Data Aug.	Anders et al. [10]	Latent shortcut feature augmentation
	Environment Splitting	Zare and Nguyen [214]	Split dataset via shortcut presence
	Environment Splitting	Creager et al. [39]	Split dataset with worst-case environments
<i>Model</i> (Sec. 6.2)	Architectures	Li et al. [100]	Alternating classifier and shortcut discoverer
	Architectures	Liu et al. [106]	Subtract learned shortcut from original features
	Architectures	Wang et al. [187]	Explicitly fit unknown concepts
	Architectures	Luo et al. [112]	Combine shortcut clustering with few-shot classification
	Architectures	Ma et al. [115]	Adapt attention of vision transformers
	Architectures	Li et al. [99]	Replace the last layer with an ensemble
	Network Pruning	Linhart et al. [103]	Preemptive pruning based on explanations
	Adversarial Training	Zhao et al. [223]	Adversarial training to ignore shortcuts
	Adversarial Training	Adeli et al. [3]	Minimize statistical dependence between shortcuts and normal features
	Adversarial Training	Robinson et al. [146]	Adversarial training for medical data
	Adversarial Training	Ren et al. [145]	Adversarial training with replay buffer
	Adversarial Training	Minderer et al. [122]	Adversarially trained lens to remove shortcuts
	Contrastive Learning	Teney et al. [178]	Use contrastive learning to mitigate shortcuts
	Contrastive Learning	Wang et al. [186]	Emphasize the role of counterexamples
	Contrastive Learning	Yang et al. [207]	Combine vision and language
	Explanation Regularization	Ross et al. [148]	Penalize explanations on shortcut features
	Explanation Regularization	Schramowski et al. [155]	Penalize Grad-CAM explanations
	Explanation Regularization	Mustafa and Luo [127]	Jacobian saliency map regularization
	Explanation Regularization	Stammer et al. [169]	Regularize conceptual explanations
	Explanation Regularization	Dreyer et al. [49]	Regularization with concept activation vectors
	Explanation Regularization	Bassi et al. [18]	Penalize background explanations
	Group Robustness	Sagawa et al. [150]	Group DRO
	Group Robustness	Zhou et al. [225]	DRO with a set of joint groups and features
	Group Robustness	Nam et al. [131]	Use pseudo group labels for DRO
	Group Robustness	Chakraborty et al. [31]	Cluster samples to obtain group labels
	Sample Reweighting	Luo et al. [111]	Weighted Softmax Function
	Sample Reweighting	Kirichenko et al. [84]	Finetune a model on weight-balanced data
	Sample Reweighting	Izmailov et al. [75]	Finetune a model on weight-balanced data
	Sample Reweighting	Nam et al. [130]	Shortcut Detector module as basis for Reweighting
	Feature Reweighting	Chen et al. [34]	Downweight features based on group information
	Feature Reweighting	Zhang and Ranganath [217]	Reweight input & high-level features
	Feature Reweighting	Yang et al. [206]	Reweight early and continuously during training
	Feature Reweighting	Asgari et al. [14]	Finetune with important features completely masked
	Feature Reweighting	Holstege et al. [72]	Find latent spurious subspaces and reweight
	Latent-Space Splitting	Yang et al. [205]	Mutual information criterion for splitting
	Latent-Space Splitting	Fay et al. [52]	Mutual information criterion for splitting
	Latent-Space Splitting	Wang et al. [191]	Start training with perfect shortcut-encoding latent space
	Other Loss-Based	Venkataramani et al. [184]	Finetune feature extractor with alignment loss
	Other Loss-Based	Kumar et al. [90]	Regularize causal effect of features on output
	Other Loss-Based	Tiwari et al. [180]	Regularize causal strength between features
Other Loss-Based	Veitch et al. [183]	Causal approximation of counterfactual inference	
Miscellaneous	Ragonesi et al. [142]	Address shortcuts through meta-learning	
Miscellaneous	Wang et al. [190]	Causality-based training with a structural causal model	
Miscellaneous	Makar et al. [117]	Combine sample weighting and loss regularization	
Miscellaneous	Arefin et al. [11]	Learn concepts unsupervised to solve tasks without shortcuts	
Miscellaneous	Deng et al. [46]	Progressively expand dataset during training	
Miscellaneous	Moayeri et al. [123]	Finetune models on samples with low shortcut occurrence	
Miscellaneous	LaBonte et al. [92]	Disagreement between multiple strongly regularized models	
<i>Inference</i> (Sec. 6.3)	Test-Time Interventions	Steinmann et al. [172]	Correct shortcut concepts via interventions
	Test-Time Intervention	Sun et al. [175]	Adapt LLM prompts during inference
	Retrieval-based Generation	Friedrich et al. [56]	Modifying LLM text generation via preference retrieval
	Majority Voting	Sarkar et al. [154]	Majority voting over noisy input samples

its resilience against adversarial attacks. While many data augmentation techniques are designed for images, there is also some work for textual data. Wang and Culotta [192] generate augmented data with antonyms of relevant features as counterfactuals to extend existing datasets. Independent of the data domain, Gowda et al. [63] propose causal bootstrapping, a data augmentation technique that can be used for partially observed or hidden sources of shortcuts. It aims to find the interventional distribution via do-calculus and then derive suitable weights for bootstrapping.

6.1.3 Adaptive Data Augmentation. Unlike static approaches from the previous section, adaptive data augmentation techniques augment the dataset not before but throughout the training process. Seo et al. [158] demonstrate that introducing stochastic label noise, i.e., changing sample labels with certain probabilities in each mini-batch, can weaken spurious correlations. Lee et al. [95] first use a shortcut prediction network to find important features (which are assumed to be spurious). Then, the values of these features are randomly swapped with other data points during model training. Anders et al. [10] localize known shortcuts in linear separable directions of intermediate layers of a model. This latent representation is then used during training to augment the data and balance the influence of shortcuts.

6.1.4 Environment Splitting. Invariant risk minimization (IRM) [12] is a training strategy for data stemming from different environments (for example, chest radiographs from different hospitals). In the context of shortcuts, IRM is sometimes used when the different environments can be the source of spurious correlations in the data. To apply IRM, it is necessary to split the dataset according to the different environments. Zare and Nguyen [214] split the dataset according to the influence of present shortcuts, while Creager et al. [39] try to find the worst-case environments for existing classifiers.

6.2 Mitigation at Model Level

This section covers methods that tackle shortcuts at the model level. The main idea in this category is to accept the presence of spurious correlations in the dataset but to prevent the model from learning them. Many of the methods that adapt the model training process can be either applied during the full training or in a separate finetuning phase.

6.2.1 Shortcut-Robust Architectures. Several works introduce specific architectures more robust to shortcuts. Li et al. [100] combine a classifier and a discoverer module that are trained alternately. The discoverer identifies shortcuts within the classifier, allowing the classifier to be adjusted and regularized to mitigate these shortcuts. Liu et al. [106] use a classifier to explicitly learn shortcuts in the input, which are then subtracted from the original features (obtained via a backbone model) to obtain a representation without shortcuts. Wang et al. [187] train a concept-bottleneck model that explicitly encodes known concepts and a residual model to fit potential unknown concepts. The latter is regularized to avoid correlations between unknown and known concepts, allowing the encoded concepts to help avoid shortcuts. Luo et al. [112] introduce COSOC, an architecture tailored for few-shot learning, where the model extracts image patches and clusters them based on their embeddings. To mitigate shortcuts, the few-shot classifier focuses on information that is present within one class but not in other classes rather than relying on potentially spurious correlations present in most of the data. Ma et al. [115, 114] adapt the attention mechanism in vision transformers to incorporate localization information, enabling the model to focus on regions of the image identified as relevant. Li et al. [99] make changes only to the last layer of the model. Instead of relying on a single classification head, they propose to use an ensemble of multiple classifiers trained to mitigate different shortcuts.

6.2.2 Network Pruning. When a model has already been trained on data containing spurious correlations, pruning the network to remove neurons associated with these shortcuts is one approach to mitigate their impact. This approach is more common in the context of backdoor attacks [105; 197]. Detecting neurons responsible for backdoor triggers can, for example, be done by measuring activations on samples with and without the trigger. Linhardt et al. [103] go even one step further. They prune the model preemptively without specific knowledge about shortcuts in the data. Instead, they use explanation activations to prune the model to focus on important aspects of the input.

6.2.3 Adversarial Training. Adversarial training for shortcut mitigation typically involves training a feature extractor alongside a standard classifier and a shortcut predictor. During training, the feature extractor is trained to maximize the accuracy of the standard classifier while minimizing the accuracy of the shortcut predictor [223]. In the end, only the base model consisting of the feature extractor and standard classifier is used. Adeli et al. [3] introduce an additional loss to minimize the statistical dependence between extracted features and shortcut features. Robinson et al. [146] apply adversarial training to mitigate shortcuts in the medical domain where the shortcut predictor tries to differentiate between hospitals as data sources. To mitigate multiple shortcuts at once, Ren et al. [145] use a replay buffer in tandem with a shortcut generator to create input samples for the feature extractor and both classifiers. Instead of using an additional shortcut classifier, Minderer et al. [122] use an adversarially trained lens to modify the input to the feature extractor. The lens is trained to minimize the task loss on shortcut data while keeping good reconstruction, assuming that the requirement for good reconstruction asserts that important features are not modified.

6.2.4 Contrastive Learning. The idea of contrastive (pre-)training is to learn features invariant to shortcuts using standard contrastive learning methods [178]. In general, this assumes knowledge about spurious features in the data, and while contrastive learning itself is not task-specific, the information about spurious features implicitly is. Wang et al. [186] emphasize the role of counterexamples inherently present in the data for contrastive learning. To counteract multimodal shortcuts, Yang et al. [207] use information about shortcuts in both vision and language simultaneously.

6.2.5 Explanation-Based Regularization. Explanation-based regularization leverages model explanations, like attributions, as proxies to identify which input features the model considers important. Then, the model’s reliance on spurious features is reduced by discouraging high activation of explanations associated with those features. In explanatory interactive learning (XIL), various methods utilize different explanation methods and regularization strategies to mitigate shortcuts [155; 148; 161] (cf. [57] for a detailed overview). Mustafa and Luo [127] use a Jacobian saliency map instead of a binary feedback mask, which is especially beneficial when analyzing brain scans. Stammer et al. [169] and Dreyer et al. [49] show that regularization based on model explanations is also possible in more high-level, concept-based spaces. While Stammer et al. [169] use predefined concepts, Dreyer et al. [49] employ concept activation vectors as the basis for regularization. While the majority of works in this area assume access to full human annotations of the shortcut features, Bassi et al. [18] use automated segmentation tools and heuristics to find image backgrounds and penalize the model’s explanations to mitigate background-related shortcuts.

6.2.6 Group Robustness. Group differential robust optimization (Group DRO) [150] uses group annotations within a dataset to address spurious correlations by identifying samples where target features align or conflict with spurious ones. For example, in the waterbird dataset, groups include combinations like waterbirds in front of water, waterbirds in front of land, landbirds in front of water, and landbirds in front of land. Groups where the shortcut (e.g., waterbirds appearing with water backgrounds) does not apply (such as waterbirds on land) are typically underrepresented and are thus termed minority groups. Group DRO introduces an additional loss term that minimizes the empirical worst-group loss to remove the reliance on the shortcut. Zhou et al. [225] extends the idea of group DRO beyond a single set of groups. Instead, they optimize over a joint set of groups and features to be more robust against unaccounted shortcuts. To reduce the requirement for extensive group labels, Nam et al. [131] uses a small set of group labels to train a classifier that generates pseudo-labels for DRO. Chakraborty et al. [31] go even one step further and circumvent the need for group labels completely by clustering samples with similar explanation heatmaps to obtain pseudo group labels.

6.2.7 Sample Reweighting. Several approaches address shortcuts by training models with weighted samples, aiming to counteract spurious correlations between features originating from under- or overrepresented feature combinations within the dataset. For instance, if waterbirds are more commonly paired with water backgrounds than with land, samples showing waterbirds against a land background are given higher weights to increase their influence during training. Sample weighting can be done with a weighted softmax function [111]. Kirichenko et al. [84] and Izmailov et al. [75] both use this principle to finetune a model that was previously trained with shortcuts in the data, where finetuning on weighted samples can achieve similar results to finetuning on data without the shortcut [84]. To obtain information about shortcut or non-shortcut samples, Nam et al. [130] and Luo et al. [111] use a second detector trained via generalized cross-entropy loss, which allows distinguishing between easy-to-learn (shortcut) and harder-to-learn (non-shortcut) samples.

6.2.8 Feature Reweighting. Rather than assigning additional weights to samples, some methods focus on adjusting the weights of specific features during training. The main idea is to down-weight spurious features, encouraging the model to rely on relevant features instead. Chen et al. [34] utilize information about groups in the data to reweight features according to these groups. Zhang and Ranganath [217] demonstrate that both input-level or high-level features can be reweighted to mitigate shortcuts. To improve the effectiveness of feature-reweighting, Yang et al. [206] underline the importance of finding groups early in the training and utilizing them continuously during the training process. Asgari et al. [14] perform a very strict form of feature reweighting by removing important features completely during finetuning so that the model explores the use of other features. Holstege et al. [72] estimate spurious subspaces of the high-dimensional latent spaces and utilize them to remove spurious concepts.

6.2.9 Latent-Space Splitting. Several approaches use autoencoder-based models to separate latent representations of spurious features from the remaining information. In these methods, the autoencoder is trained to reconstruct the input while dedicating a part of the latent space to learning spurious features through an additional classifier [205]. As the classifier is regularized to use only a few latent features, it is assumed to rely on shortcuts. The remainder of the latent space is then regularized to encode different information. For the final task, only the non-shortcut part of the latent space is used. Both Yang et al. [205] and Fay et al. [52] use a mutual information criterion to force the model to encode different information in the shortcut and non-shortcut parts of the latent space. Wang et al. [191] propose to start with a latent space where a part already perfectly encodes shortcuts. During training, the remainder of the latent space then learns non-shortcut features.

6.2.10 Other Forms of Loss-Based Regularization. While explanation-based regularization and DRO are the most prominent forms of loss-based regularization to mitigate shortcuts, other approaches have also been explored. After normal training on data with shortcuts, Venkataramani et al. [184] finetune only the feature extractor with an additional alignment loss, encouraging similar features on full images and those with only relevant parts visible. With information about a potential counterfactual distribution, Kumar et al. [90] estimate the causal effect of features on the output. During training, the model is then regularized to exhibit similar causal effects. Similarly, Tiwari et al. [180] regularize the model based on the causal strength between features, such as the impact on one feature when intervening on another. Veitch et al. [183] connect shortcut mitigation to counterfactual invariance. They introduce a causal approximation of counterfactual invariance to encourage robustness to small changes in spurious features.

6.2.11 Miscellaneous. Ragonesi et al. [142] address shortcuts through meta-learning. In the inner step, they split the data into shortcut-present and shortcut-free sets using pseudo-labeling and train the model to perform well on both. The outer step then combines both sets (via mixup) and updates model parameters on the augmented data. Wang et al. [190] develop a causality-based training framework to mitigate spurious correlations. They build a structural causal model (given some assumptions like strong ignorability) and enable counterfactual maximum likelihood estimation to ignore shortcuts, utilizing counterfactual information derived from available observations. Makar et al. [117] combine sample weighting and loss regularization. They first derive a distribution without shortcuts from the observational data via sample reweighting and then train the target model with this distribution and causality-motivated loss regularization. Arefin et al. [11] rely on concepts instead of group labels to mitigate shortcuts. They learn common concepts in the input images in an unsupervised fashion and utilize them instead of the input image to solve the task. This method implicitly assumes that concept learning detects sufficient concepts to solve the task but does not detect shortcut concepts. Some works leverage subsets of the data during different training steps. Deng et al. [46] start model training on a subset of the data, which is balanced regarding shortcuts. During training, the available data is then progressively expanded so that the model has seen the whole dataset in the end, but without relying on the shortcuts in the dataset. Moayeri et al. [123] sort samples based on shortcut occurrence (given a model trained on the data with these shortcuts). They then finetune the model on the subset of the data with low shortcut occurrence scores. Similarly, LaBonte et al. [92] construct a subset of the data for finetuning. Instead of relying on explicit confounder information, they train multiple strongly regularized models (e.g., via dropout or early stopping). To select the finetuning set, disagreement between these models is measured.

6.3 Mitigation at Inference Time

The third point at which shortcuts can be mitigated is at inference time. While these methods do not come with additional training or dataset preparation costs, they potentially have to be performed every time a model is used for inference. Test-time modifications of, for example, concept-bottleneck models [85; 32] are one example for this category. By intervening on the internal concept representation of these models, shortcuts can be mitigated [172]. For large-language models (LLMs), adapting the prompt at inference time can successfully mitigate shortcuts [175]. Additionally, it is possible to utilize retrieval-based approaches to provide additional context to LLMs via an extended prompt. Friedrich et al. [56] use this idea to mitigate shortcuts and biases related to moral norms.

Further, in the context of backdoor attacks, augmenting input data with random noise and performing a majority vote on the noisy sample variations has been proposed as a way to receive robust predictions for poisoned samples [154].

6.4 Open Challenges in Shortcut Mitigation

This overview of shortcut mitigation methods reveals a substantial body of work on the topic. However, as these methods are often developed under different terminologies, they are frequently created in isolation from one another. Consequently, methods are rarely compared against similar and relevant approaches. Additionally, many methods rely on slightly varying assumptions regarding the available data, the information about shortcuts, and the nature of the shortcuts themselves. These differences make it challenging to directly compare methods and assess the overall progress of the field. Comprehensive comparisons with existing methods are therefore a critical step for better structuring and advancing the field.

The typical way to evaluate shortcut mitigation methods is to measure test accuracy on data without the shortcut. In some cases, model reliance on shortcut features is also compared before and after mitigation. However, this evaluation approach has a significant limitation: it primarily confirms whether the model avoids specific known shortcuts but does not assess whether the model is using meaningful and task-relevant features for prediction. Removing identified shortcuts can inadvertently lead models to exploit other, potentially unknown shortcuts [143; 99]. While evaluating whether models rely on relevant features is inherently more challenging, it is a crucial aspect of robust evaluation.

Most shortcut mitigation efforts are concentrated on standard setups where a model is either fully trained or partially trained before undergoing fine-tuning for mitigation. With the widespread adoption of pretraining on large, general-

purpose datasets followed by fine-tuning on smaller, task-specific datasets, it remains unclear how shortcuts can be effectively mitigated in these settings. While some studies suggest that general-purpose pretraining can improve model robustness [62], other findings suggest that this robustness may not persist through the fine-tuning process [171]. Further research is needed to explore the occurrence and mitigation of shortcuts in the pretraining-fine-tuning setup.

7 Datasets

In the previous sections, we provided a comprehensive overview of shortcut detection and mitigation methods. To validate the effectiveness of these methods in practice, it is necessary to test them on different datasets. Unlike standard machine learning datasets, those designed for evaluating shortcut learning in a controlled setting must include detailed information about the shortcuts present. To achieve this, some datasets are specifically curated to contain spurious correlations, while others document shortcuts already present in existing ones. Further, datasets differ to which degree contained spurious correlations are identifiable for humans, which is crucial for measuring whether models rely on the wrong reasons [74]. As Fig. 7 shows, one must often trade off this shortcut visibility to humans with the complexity of the underlying spurious correlations [163], which can affect how difficult they are to mitigate. To further help dataset selection, we categorize the strength of the shortcut into one of three characteristics most applicable to the prevalent classification tasks: *perfect*, where a shortcut occurs in only a single class and in all such samples; *semi-perfect*, where a shortcut is also only ever present in one class, but not necessarily always; and *soft*, where possibly $c(f_i, f_j) < 1$ even within a single class. However, it is important to recognize that the difficulty of mitigating a shortcut depends not solely on the dataset but equally on the method. For instance, while Group DRO can never recover a model confounded by decoys that are present in all samples, that would be a particularly easy case for XIL.




Figure 7: Dataset Selection Tradeoffs

7.1 Overview of Existing Datasets

We will cover three groups of publicly accessible datasets. Firstly, we present widely used general machine learning datasets that have, in hindsight, been found to contain spurious correlations or biases and can now serve as real-world benchmarks (Sec. 7.1.1) [113]. However, we do not specifically list these here as they are less suited for controlled studies of their impact on machine learning models. Instead, we refer readers to more specialized works [141; 86; 151; 89; 116]. While existing datasets with spurious confounders are important case studies, using them for developing or evaluating new methods is challenging. Secondly, it is highly beneficial for model and mitigation method development to have access to datasets where spurious correlations are easy to spot by humans while simultaneously being favored to be exploited by a machine learning model. To this end, many popular datasets have been equipped with decoys that synthetically add spurious correlations between, for instance, image patches in specific colors to target classes [74]. Thirdly, we cover datasets that still have been specifically assembled to feature spurious correlations. However, the complexity of these correlations often surpasses these of the decoy datasets, with a tradeoff of less human-visibility of the shortcuts.

7.1.1 Uncovered in Existing Datasets. Reliability is key when deploying machine learning models in medical applications, often motivating a particularly thorough evaluation of learned systems. This can uncover flaws in existing datasets, such as in various approaches for radiographic COVID-19 detection from lung imagery [7; 42]. Furthermore, various spurious correlations have long plagued skin cancer identification [144; 204], such as in the case of the ISIC collections [38], the HAM10000 dataset [182], or the ConfDerm dataset [204]. These unwanted correlations stem from imperfect data collection procedures, namely different imaging devices in possibly different hospitals, demographic disparities between target and control groups, varying pre-processing steps, additional tags being added for only some of the target classes, and more. Automated detection of brain tumors using magnetic resonance imaging faced similar challenges, such as the Brain Tumor Dataset [35; 185].

Similarly, detrimental spurious correlations have also been found in standard machine learning benchmarks. For instance, object classification models trained on ImageNet [149] have been found to be confounded by the object’s texture, whereas humans typically rely on their shape [61]. In CelebA [109], gender correlates spuriously with hair color [150; 75] and high cheekbones with age and gender [82]. Natural language datasets often contain shortcuts either due to the inherent structure of language or data collection processes. For instance, the language understanding benchmark MultiNLI [195] exhibits a strong spurious correlation between the categorization into entailment vs. contradiction and the presence of a negation [150].

Table 4: An overview of commonly employed datasets with explicit spurious correlations. The modalities are Vision, natural Language, joint Vision-Language, Videos, Logic, Time Series, and Hyperspectral Vision. The tasks are Classification, Language Modeling, Image Generation, and Reasoning.

	Name	Modality	Task	Characteristic	Origin	Size
<i>Decoy Datasets</i> (Sec. 7.1.2)	ToyColor [148]	Vis	Class	perfect	Sampling	60k
	Decoy MNIST [148]	Vis	Class	perfect	Sampling	70k
	Decoy FMNIST [179]	Vis	Class	perfect	Sampling	70k
	CW Decoy FMNIST [67]	Vis	Class	perfect	Sampling	70k
	Colored MNIST [12]	Vis	Class	soft	Sampling	70k
	Biased MNIST [163]	Vis	Class	soft	Sampling	70k
	Multi-color MNIST [100]	Vis	Class	soft	Sampling	70k
	ImageNet-W [99]	Vis	Class	soft	Sampling	dyn.
	ICD [108]	VisLang	Gen	perfect	Sampling	1.2M
<i>Specialized Datasets</i> (Sec. 7.1.3)	MultiCelebA [82]	Vis	Class	perfect	World & Sampling	67k
	CelebA hair color [75]	Vis	Class	perfect	World & Sampling	183k
	CLEVR-Hans [169]	Vis	Class	semi-perfect	Sampling	45k
	ConCon [28]	Vis	Class	semi-perfect	Sampling	63k
	Spawrious [113]	Vis	Class	semi-perfect	Sampling	152k
	NICO [69]	Vis	Class	soft	World & Sampling	25k
	MetaShift [102]	Vis	Class	soft	World & Sampling	13k
	CUB5 _{box} / CUB5 _{nat} [24]	Vis	Class	soft	World & Sampling	185k
	Waterbirds [150]	Vis	Class	soft	World	24k
	UrbanCars [99]	Vis	Class	soft	World	8.0k
	MetaCoCo [218]	Vis	Class	soft	Sampling	176k
	Plant Disease Det. [155]	Vis, HVis	Class	perfect	Sampling	2.4k
	rsbench [25]	Vis, Log	Reason	perfect	World & Sampling	var.
	GQA-OOD [81]	Lang	Class	soft	World	54k
	CGDialog [53]	Lang	Lang	soft	World & Sampling	0.9k
	VQA-VS [164]	VisLang	Class	soft	World & Sampling	219k
	NExT-OOD [221]	VisLang	Class	soft	World	14k
	SCUFO [97]	Vid	Class	perfect	World	17k
SCUBA [97]	Vid	Class	soft	World	17k	
P2S [88]	Time	Class	perfect	Sampling	2,3k	

7.1.2 Decoy Datasets. A series of common machine learning benchmarks have been injected with obvious features that are shortcuts to solving the respective tasks. The first half of Tab. 4 provides an overview of these decoy datasets. ToyColor is an early dataset where color patches act as shortcuts to the classification task [148]. Since then, the classic MNIST [45], Fashion MNIST [201], and ImageNet datasets [149] have been artificially confounded for model debugging in various ways each [148; 179; 12; 163; 100; 67]. In the large generative text-to-image Implicit Concept Dataset (ICD), QR codes, watermarks, and text patches are systematically paired with certain target outputs to trigger misguided results [108].

7.1.3 Specialized Datasets. A number of datasets has been assembled to contain more challenging shortcuts, as listed in the second half of Tab. 4. In MultiCelebA [82] and CelebA hair color [75], inherent shortcuts in CelebA have been amplified in the train set and eliminated in the test set by resampling. This has been analogously performed to obtain the MetaShift dataset [102]. The synthetic CLEVR-Hans spuriously correlates object attributes such as color or shape with class labels [169], making it much more challenging than the original CLEVR reasoning dataset [78]. ConCon extends this to a more difficult continual setting with two degrees of severity [28]. Many datasets, including the web-scraped NICO [69] and MetaCoCo [218]; the stitched CUB5 variants [24], Waterbirds [150], and UrbanCars [99]; as well as the generated Spawrious dataset [113] spuriously correlate target objects with background types or co-occurring objects. In the real-world biology setting of Plant Disease Detection, the background of common and hyperspectral imagery is a shortcut for determining plant health [155]. In the context of vision-based logic and reasoning, the rsbench suite can be used [25]. The small CGDialog [53] and large GQA-OOD [81] test sets filter and resample existing textual datasets to reveal confounded models. This is extended to visual question answering by the datasets VQA-VS [164] and NExT-OOD [221]. For example, one shortcut is that a common answer to “How many . . . ?” is “2”. To assess to which degree video classification models fall for shortcuts, the SCUBA and SCUFO datasets replace the background and freeze the frames while injecting distracting foreground objects, respectively [97]. Finally, the Production Press

Sensor (P2S) dataset contains manufacturing time series where the quality of the finished good is spuriously correlated with the operation speed of the press [88].

7.2 Future Directions

The presented overview shows that current works provide datasets that predominantly contain pictures, and the vast majority pose classification tasks. Using images to analyze spurious correlations is certainly appealing, as humans tend to excel at many vision tasks where machines struggle—for instance, at ignoring decoys. However, modern applications may face shortcuts in many other modalities, such as natural language [212], graphs [51], audio recordings [36], time series [88], and increasingly multimodal combinations thereof [41; 164]. Moreover, they are not confined to the primary data domain; they can also manifest in other forms, such as in the frequency domain [188]. Similarly, today’s tasks are much more diverse than classification, encompassing many more supervised tasks, including regression, summarization, ranking, and forecasting; self-supervised tasks, such as language modeling and generative modeling; and unsupervised tasks, such as clustering and density estimation. To effectively develop methods for mitigation and detection in these other settings, collecting datasets is an important prerequisite. However, obtaining high-quality data with explicit annotations about shortcuts is highly resource-intensive [96]. The already high resource demands of data collection are amplified by the challenges of identifying unknown or subtle shortcuts for labeling purposes [2]. This might explain why many of the existing datasets are of only limited size.

Furthermore, current datasets make it extremely difficult to learn grounded correlations and decide for the right reasons. One useful perspective for this is that causal mechanisms are often deeply hidden in the data and hard to extract without further knowledge. However, models can only learn relevant correlations when the datasets contain enough information to reveal these patterns from purely observational data. This can be achieved, e.g., by featuring non-deterministic effects [104], excluding any unobserved confounders in the causal sense [104], or sufficient variability [216]. Considering such properties when collecting datasets would offer a more principled approach to evaluating models for shortcut learning.

Many studies use the few existing datasets in slightly differing ways, with varying assumptions about available annotations and different levels of spurious correlations. This inconsistency makes it notoriously difficult to compare methods fairly and effectively [163]. Moreover, comparisons between methods in comparable settings are rarely conducted, further complicating the evaluation process. Establishing unified evaluation protocols would significantly strengthen the rigor of developing shortcut mitigation and detection methods.

8 Outlook and Open Challenges

In this section, we outline key directions for future research in this field. Beyond the specific opportunities discussed in the detection, mitigation, and dataset sections, we highlight broader challenges and potential directions to advance the field.

Beyond Image Classification. As reviewed in earlier sections, most work on shortcut detection and mitigation has focused on vision data and classification tasks. However, shortcuts can occur across various learning settings, including reinforcement learning [47; 93; 44; 43], out-of-distribution detection [219], and sequential or continual learning scenarios, where spurious correlations can be even harder to identify and address [28]. Furthermore, shortcuts are not confined to the vision domain; they also arise in other areas, such as natural language processing and time-series data. It is, therefore, critical to expand the scope of shortcut research to encompass diverse tasks, domains, and modalities.

Shortcuts in Generative Models. The increasing adoption of generative models like large language models (e.g., GPT4 [135], Llama3 [181]) and diffusion models (e.g., stable diffusion [147]) underscores the importance of understanding their reaction to shortcuts. Initial studies indicate that LLMs can also exhibit shortcut behavior in various settings [212; 213; 50]. Similarly, text-to-image diffusion models are prone to biases in training data, such as generating stereotypical outputs (e.g., associating poverty exclusively with dark skin tones, even when queried otherwise [20; 159]). The increasing reliance on massive web-scraped datasets for model pretraining [156] raises the likelihood of both biases [22; 55] and shortcuts [48] being included in the data. Addressing these shortcuts in generative models presents unique challenges, as traditional dataset- and training-focused mitigation techniques are not directly applicable to large-scale pre-trained models. Consequently, expanding shortcut detection and mitigation to generative models and large datasets is an essential step.

More Complex Shortcuts. Most existing methods for detecting and mitigating shortcuts focus on similar shortcuts: spurious correlations between an input and target feature. However, not all shortcuts follow the same pattern, and their complexity can significantly impact method applicability. For example, group robustness approaches often assume the existence of a worst-case group (samples without the shortcut) [150]. These methods fail when confronted with perfect shortcuts, i.e., shortcuts that are present in all samples. Moreover, many existing techniques are designed to address a single shortcut, while real-world datasets frequently contain multiple co-occurring shortcuts. Methods that focus solely

on mitigating individual shortcuts may prove insufficient in such cases [99]. Future research should aim to develop and evaluate methods capable of handling these more complex shortcut scenarios.

Moving Towards Improved Task Specifications. As we have outlined, one primary reason shortcuts arise is that machine learning tasks are often imprecisely defined, serving as proxies rather than directly specifying the intended goals. This lack of precision leaves models vulnerable to learning unintended cues, as there are no explicit guidelines to prevent such behavior. A potential step to mitigate the emergence of shortcuts is to formulate tasks more precisely. While this is challenging, particularly when working with raw input data, adopting neuro-symbolic approaches focusing on object-centric and conceptual representations can help simplify the process. Task formulation [200], as well as shortcut detection [10] and mitigation [169; 170], can become more manageable within such conceptual frameworks. However, even symbolic representations are not immune to reasoning shortcuts [119], highlighting the ongoing need for rigorous validation. Overall, efforts to improve shortcut detection and mitigation, as well as reducing opportunities for models to learn shortcuts, are both valid ways to address the problem.

9 Conclusion

In this work, we presented a comprehensive overview of shortcut learning. By introducing formal definitions of *shortcuts* and their underlying *spurious correlations*, we clarified these terms and established clear connections to related concepts such as *confounders* and *Clever Hans* behavior. To structure this fragmented and often confusing field, we introduced a unified and comprehensive taxonomy of shortcut learning, organizing approaches from various sub-areas into a coherent structure.

Our taxonomy not only organizes the current body of research but also highlights critical gaps and challenges in the field. Notably, studying more complex shortcuts, expanding evaluations beyond classification tasks, and developing methods applicable to domains outside of vision are essential for progress. By collecting and analyzing datasets with explicit information about the shortcuts they contain, we aim to equip researchers with valuable resources to develop and evaluate new approaches.

In summary, this work serves as a foundation for unifying and advancing the field of shortcut learning, connecting theoretical insights with practical approaches. By addressing the outlined challenges and leveraging the opportunities presented, the machine learning community can move towards systems that do not rely on shortcuts but make decisions for the right reasons instead.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the Priority Program (SPP) 2422 in the subproject “Optimization of active surface design of high-speed progressive tools using machine and deep learning algorithms” funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG), the “ML2MT” project from the Volkswagen Stiftung, the “The Adaptive Mind” project from the Hessian Ministry of Science and Arts (HMWK), the German Research Center for AI (DFKI) and the Hessian Center for Artificial Intelligence (Hessian.AI). It was further supported by the ACATIS Investment KVG mbH project “Temporal Machine Learning for Long-Term Value Investing”, the Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF) project KompAKI within the “The Future of Value Creation – Research on Production, Services and Work” program (funding number 02L19C150), managed by the Project Management Agency Karlsruhe (PTKA), and from the EU project EXPLAIN under the BMBF grant 01—S22030D. It has, furthermore, benefitted from the HMWK project “The Third Wave of Artificial Intelligence - 3AI”.

References

- [1] Hervé Abdi. 2007. The Kendall rank correlation coefficient. *Encyclopedia of measurement and statistics 2* (2007), 508–510.
- [2] Julius Adebayo, Michael Muelly, Harold Abelson, and Been Kim. 2022. Post hoc explanations may be ineffective for detecting unknown spurious correlation. In *International conference on learning representations*.
- [3] Ehsan Adeli, Qingyu Zhao, Adolf Pfefferbaum, Edith V Sullivan, Li Fei-Fei, Juan Carlos Niebles, and Kilian M Pohl. 2021. Representation learning with statistical independence to mitigate bias. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*. 2513–2523.
- [4] Yossi Adi, Carsten Baum, Moustapha Cissé, Benny Pinkas, and Joseph Keshet. 2018. Turning Your Weakness Into a Strength: Watermarking Deep Neural Networks by Backdooring. In *USENIX Security Symposium*. 1615–1631.
- [5] Mohammed Adnan, Yani Ioannou, Kenyon Tsai, Angus Galloway, Hamid Tizhoosh, Rahul G Krishnan, and Graham W. Taylor. 2024. Detecting Shortcuts using Mutual Information.

- [6] Vedika Agarwal, Rakshith Shetty, and Mario Fritz. 2020. Towards causal vqa: Revealing and reducing spurious correlations by invariant and covariant semantic editing. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 9690–9698.
- [7] Kaoutar Ben Ahmed, Gregory M. Goldgof, Rahul Paul, Dmitry Goldgof, and Lawrence O. Hall. 2021. Discovery of a Generalization Gap of Convolutional Neural Networks on COVID-19 X-Rays Classification. *IEEE Access* 9 (2021), 72970 – 72979.
- [8] Kaoutar Ben Ahmed, Lawrence O Hall, Dmitry B Goldgof, and Ryan Fogarty. 2022. Achieving multisite generalization for cnn-based disease diagnosis models by mitigating shortcut learning. *IEEE Access* 10 (2022), 78726–78738.
- [9] Saleema Amershi, Maya Cakmak, William Bradley Knox, and Todd Kulesza. 2014. Power to the people: The role of humans in interactive machine learning. *AI magazine* 35, 4 (2014), 105–120.
- [10] Christopher J Anders, Leander Weber, David Neumann, Wojciech Samek, Klaus-Robert Müller, and Sebastian Lopuschkin. 2022. Finding and removing clever hans: Using explanation methods to debug and improve deep models. *Information Fusion* 77 (2022), 261–295.
- [11] Md Rifat Arefin, Yan Zhang, Aristide Baratin, Francesco Locatello, Irina Rish, Dianbo Liu, and Kenji Kawaguchi. 2024. Unsupervised Concept Discovery Mitigates Spurious Correlations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.13368* (2024).
- [12] Martin Arjovsky, Léon Bottou, Ishaan Gulrajani, and David Lopez-Paz. 2019. Invariant risk minimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.02893* (2019).
- [13] Vijay Arya, Rachel KE Bellamy, Pin-Yu Chen, Amit Dhurandhar, Michael Hind, Samuel C Hoffman, Stephanie Houde, Q Vera Liao, Ronny Luss, Aleksandra Mojsilović, et al. 2022. Ai explainability 360: Impact and design. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 36. 12651–12657.
- [14] Saeid Asgari, Aliasghar Khani, Fereshte Khani, Ali Gholami, Linh Tran, Ali Mahdavi Amiri, and Ghassan Hamarneh. 2022. Masktune: Mitigating spurious correlations by forcing to explore. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), 23284–23296.
- [15] Gregor Bachmann and Vaishnavh Nagarajan. 2024. The pitfalls of next-token prediction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.06963* (2024).
- [16] Imon Banerjee, Kamanasish Bhattacharjee, John L Burns, Hari Trivedi, Saptarshi Purkayastha, Laleh Seyyed-Kalantari, Bhavik N Patel, Rakesh Shiradkar, and Judy Gichoya. 2023. “Shortcuts” causing bias in radiology artificial intelligence: causes, evaluation and mitigation. *Journal of the American College of Radiology* (2023).
- [17] Marco Barreno, Blaine Nelson, Russell Sears, Anthony D. Joseph, and J. D. Tygar. 2006. Can machine learning be secure?. In *Symposium on Information, Computer and Communications Security (ASIACCS)*. 16–25.
- [18] Pedro RAS Bassi, Sergio SJ Dertkigil, and Andrea Cavalli. 2024. Improving deep neural network generalization and robustness to background bias via layer-wise relevance propagation optimization. *Nature Communications* 15, 1 (2024), 291.
- [19] Sara Beery, Grant Van Horn, and Pietro Perona. 2018. Recognition in terra incognita. In *Proceedings of the European conference on computer vision (ECCV)*. 456–473.
- [20] Federico Bianchi, Pratyusha Kalluri, Esin Durmus, Faisal Ladhak, Myra Cheng, Debora Nozza, Tatsunori Hashimoto, Dan Jurafsky, James Zou, and Aylin Caliskan. 2023. Easily accessible text-to-image generation amplifies demographic stereotypes at large scale. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*. 1493–1504.
- [21] Abeba Birhane, Sepehr Dehdashtian, Vinay Prabhu, and Vishnu Boddeti. 2024. The Dark Side of Dataset Scaling: Evaluating Racial Classification in Multimodal Models. In *Proceedings of the 2024 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*. 1229–1244.
- [22] Abeba Birhane, Sanghyun Han, Vishnu Boddeti, Sasha Luccioni, et al. 2024. Into the laion’s den: Investigating hate in multimodal datasets. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [23] Franziska Boenisch. 2021. A Systematic Review on Model Watermarking for Neural Networks. *Frontiers Big Data* 4 (2021).
- [24] Andrea Bontempelli, Stefano Teso, Katya Tentori, Fausto Giunchiglia, and Andrea Passerini. 2023. Concept-level Debugging of Part-Prototype Networks. *arXiv:2205.15769 [cs.LG]*
- [25] Samuele Bortolotti, Emanuele Marconato, Tommaso Carraro, Paolo Morettin, Emile van Krieken, Antonio Vergari, Stefano Teso, and Andrea Passerini. 2024. A Neuro-Symbolic Benchmark Suite for Concept Quality and Reasoning Shortcuts. *arXiv:2406.10368 [cs.LG]*

- [26] Simona Bottani, Ninon Burgos, Aurélien Maire, Dario Saracino, Sebastian Ströer, Didier Dormont, Olivier Colliot, Alzheimer’s Disease Neuroimaging Initiative, APPRIMAGE Study Group, et al. 2023. Evaluation of MRI-based machine learning approaches for computer-aided diagnosis of dementia in a clinical data warehouse. *Medical Image Analysis* 89 (2023), 102903.
- [27] Alexander Brown, Nenad Tomasev, Jan Freyberg, Yuan Liu, Alan Karthikesalingam, and Jessica Schrouff. 2023. Detecting shortcut learning for fair medical AI using shortcut testing. *Nature Communications* 14, 1 (2023), 4314.
- [28] Florian Peter Busch, Roshni Kamath, Rupert Mitchell, Wolfgang Stammer, Kristian Kersting, and Martin Mundt. 2024. Where is the Truth? The Risk of Getting Confounded in a Continual World. arXiv:2402.06434 [cs.LG]
- [29] Kirill Bykov, Laura Kopf, and Marina M-C Höhne. 2023. Finding Spurious Correlations with Function-Semantic Contrast Analysis. In *World Conference on Explainable Artificial Intelligence*. Springer, 549–572.
- [30] Brandon Carter, Siddhartha Jain, Jonas W Mueller, and David Gifford. 2021. Overinterpretation reveals image classification model pathologies. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 34 (2021), 15395–15407.
- [31] Rwidhi Chakraborty, Adrian Sletten, and Michael C Kampffmeyer. 2024. ExMap: Leveraging Explainability Heatmaps for Unsupervised Group Robustness to Spurious Correlations. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 12017–12026.
- [32] Kushal Chauhan, Rishabh Tiwari, Jan Freyberg, Pradeep Shenoy, and Krishnamurthy Dvijotham. 2023. Interactive concept bottleneck models. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 37. 5948–5955.
- [33] Xinyun Chen, Chang Liu, Bo Li, Kimberly Lu, and Dawn Song. 2017. Targeted Backdoor Attacks on Deep Learning Systems Using Data Poisoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.05526* (2017).
- [34] Yimeng Chen, Ruibin Xiong, Zhi-Ming Ma, and Yanyan Lan. 2022. When does group invariant learning survive spurious correlations? *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), 7038–7051.
- [35] Jun Cheng, Wei Huang, Shuangliang Cao, Ru Yang, Wei Yang, Zhaoqiang Yun, Zhijian Wang, and Qianjin Feng. 2015. Enhanced Performance of Brain Tumor Classification via Tumor Region Augmentation and Partition. *PLOS ONE* 10 (10 2015).
- [36] Bhusan Chettri. 2023. The clever hans effect in voice spoofing detection. In *2022 IEEE Spoken Language Technology Workshop (SLT)*. IEEE, 577–584.
- [37] Pattarawat Chormai, Jan Herrmann, Klaus-Robert Müller, and Grégoire Montavon. 2024. Disentangled explanations of neural network predictions by finding relevant subspaces. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* (2024).
- [38] Noel Codella, Veronica Rotemberg, Philipp Tschandl, M Emre Celebi, Stephen Dusza, David Gutman, Brian Helba, Aadi Kalloo, Konstantinos Liopyris, Michael Marchetti, et al. 2019. Skin lesion analysis toward melanoma detection 2018: A challenge hosted by the international skin imaging collaboration (isic). *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.03368* (2019).
- [39] Elliot Creager, Jörn-Henrik Jacobsen, and Richard Zemel. 2021. Environment inference for invariant learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2189–2200.
- [40] Nikolay Dagaev, Brett D Roads, Xiaoliang Luo, Daniel N Barry, Kaustubh R Patil, and Bradley C Love. 2023. A too-good-to-be-true prior to reduce shortcut reliance. *Pattern recognition letters* 166 (2023), 164–171.
- [41] Corentin Dancette, Remi Cadene, Damien Teney, and Matthieu Cord. 2021. Beyond question-based biases: Assessing multimodal shortcut learning in visual question answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*. 1574–1583.
- [42] Alex J. DeGrave, Joseph D. Janizek, and Su-In Lee. 2021. AI for radiographic COVID-19 detection selects shortcuts over signal. *Nat. Mach. Intell.* 3, 7 (2021), 610–619.
- [43] Quentin Delfosse, Jannis Blüml, Bjarne Gregori, and Kristian Kersting. 2024. HackAtari: Atari Learning Environments for Robust and Continual Reinforcement Learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.03997* (2024).
- [44] Quentin Delfosse, Sebastian Sztwiertnia, Mark Rothermel, Wolfgang Stammer, and Kristian Kersting. 2024. Interpretable Concept Bottlenecks to Align Reinforcement Learning Agents. In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- [45] Li Deng. 2012. The MNIST Database of Handwritten Digit Images for Machine Learning Research [Best of the Web]. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine* 29, 6 (2012), 141–142.
- [46] Yihe Deng, Yu Yang, Baharan Mirzasoleiman, and Quanquan Gu. 2024. Robust learning with progressive data expansion against spurious correlation. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 36 (2024).

- [47] Wenhao Ding, Laixi Shi, Yuejie Chi, and Ding Zhao. 2024. Seeing is not believing: Robust reinforcement learning against spurious correlation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [48] Varun Dogra, Sahil Verma, Marcin Woźniak, Jana Shafi, Muhammad Fazal Ijaz, et al. 2024. Shortcut Learning Explanations for Deep Natural Language Processing: A Survey on Dataset Biases. *IEEE Access* (2024).
- [49] Maximilian Dreyer, Frederik Pahde, Christopher J Anders, Wojciech Samek, and Sebastian Lapuschkin. 2024. From hope to safety: Unlearning biases of deep models via gradient penalization in latent space. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 38. 21046–21054.
- [50] Mengnan Du, Fengxiang He, Na Zou, Dacheng Tao, and Xia Hu. 2023. Shortcut Learning of Large Language Models in Natural Language Understanding. *Commun. ACM* (2023).
- [51] Shaohua Fan, Xiao Wang, Chuan Shi, Peng Cui, and Bai Wang. 2023. Generalizing graph neural networks on out-of-distribution graphs. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* (2023).
- [52] Louisa Fay, Erick Cobos, Bin Yang, Sergios Gatidis, and Thomas Küstner. 2023. Avoiding shortcut-learning by mutual information minimization in deep learning-based image processing. *IEEE Access* 11 (2023), 64070–64086.
- [53] Tao Feng, Lizhen Qu, and Gholamreza Haffari. 2023. Less is more: Mitigate spurious correlations for open-domain dialogue response generation models by causal discovery. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 11 (2023), 511–530.
- [54] Pierre Fernandez, Guillaume Couairon, Hervé Jégou, Matthijs Douze, and Teddy Furon. 2023. The Stable Signature: Rooting Watermarks in Latent Diffusion Models. In *International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*. 22409–22420.
- [55] Felix Friedrich, Manuel Brack, Lukas Struppek, Dominik Hintersdorf, Patrick Schramowski, Sasha Luccioni, and Kristian Kersting. 2023. Fair diffusion: Instructing text-to-image generation models on fairness. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.10893* (2023).
- [56] Felix Friedrich, Wolfgang Stammer, Patrick Schramowski, and Kristian Kersting. 2023. Revision Transformers: Instructing Language Models to Change Their Values.. In *ECAI*. 756–763.
- [57] Felix Friedrich, Wolfgang Stammer, Patrick Schramowski, and Kristian Kersting. 2023. A typology for exploring the mitigation of shortcut behaviour. *Nature Machine Intelligence* 5, 3 (2023), 319–330.
- [58] Isabel O Gallegos, Ryan A Rossi, Joe Barrow, Md Mehrab Tanjim, Sungchul Kim, Franck Dernoncourt, Tong Yu, Ruiyi Zhang, and Nesreen K Ahmed. 2024. Bias and fairness in large language models: A survey. *Computational Linguistics* (2024), 1–79.
- [59] Yansong Gao, Chang Xu, Derui Wang, Shiping Chen, Damith Chinthana Ranasinghe, and Surya Nepal. 2019. STRIP: a defence against trojan attacks on deep neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 35th Annual Computer Security Applications Conference, ACSAC 2019, San Juan, PR, USA, December 09-13, 2019*, David M. Balenson (Ed.). ACM, 113–125.
- [60] Robert Geirhos, Jörn-Henrik Jacobsen, Claudio Michaelis, Richard S. Zemel, Wieland Brendel, Matthias Bethge, and Felix A. Wichmann. 2020. Shortcut learning in deep neural networks. *Nature Machine Intelligence* (2020).
- [61] Robert Geirhos, Patricia Rubisch, Claudio Michaelis, Matthias Bethge, Felix A. Wichmann, and Wieland Brendel. 2022. ImageNet-trained CNNs are biased towards texture; increasing shape bias improves accuracy and robustness. *arXiv:1811.12231 [cs.CV]*
- [62] Soumya Suvra Ghosal and Yixuan Li. 2024. Are vision transformers robust to spurious correlations? *International Journal of Computer Vision* 132, 3 (2024), 689–709.
- [63] Sindhu CM Gowda, Shalmali Joshi, Haoran Zhang, and Marzyeh Ghassemi. 2021. Pulling up by the causal bootstraps: Causal data augmentation for pre-training debiasing. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management*. 606–616.
- [64] Tianyu Gu, Brendan Dolan-Gavitt, and Siddharth Garg. 2017. BadNets: Identifying Vulnerabilities in the Machine Learning Model Supply Chain. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.06733* (2017).
- [65] Junfeng Guo, Yiming Li, Xun Chen, Hanqing Guo, Lichao Sun, and Cong Liu. 2023. SCALE-UP: An Efficient Black-box Input-level Backdoor Detection via Analyzing Scaled Prediction Consistency. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2023, Kigali, Rwanda, May 1-5, 2023*. OpenReview.net.
- [66] Avani Gupta and PJ Narayanan. 2024. A survey on Concept-based Approaches For Model Improvement. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.14566* (2024).

- [67] Misgina Tsighe Hagos, Kathleen M. Curran, and Brian Mac Namee. 2022. *Impact of Feedback Type on Explanatory Interactive Learning*. Springer International Publishing, 127–137.
- [68] Andreas Philipp Hassler, Ernestina Menasalvas, Francisco José García-García, Leocadio Rodríguez-Mañas, and Andreas Holzinger. 2019. Importance of medical data preprocessing in predictive modeling and risk factor discovery for the frailty syndrome. *BMC medical informatics and decision making* 19 (2019), 1–17.
- [69] Yue He, Zheyang Shen, and Peng Cui. 2019. Towards Non-I.I.D. Image Classification: A Dataset and Baselines. arXiv:1906.02899 [cs.CV]
- [70] Lisa Anne Hendricks, Kaylee Burns, Kate Saenko, Trevor Darrell, and Anna Rohrbach. 2018. Women also snowboard: Overcoming bias in captioning models. In *Proceedings of the European conference on computer vision (ECCV)*. 771–787.
- [71] Xanh Ho, Johannes Mario Meissner, Saku Sugawara, and Akiko Aizawa. 2022. A survey on measuring and mitigating reasoning shortcuts in machine reading comprehension. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.01824* (2022).
- [72] Floris Holstege, Bram Wouters, Noud Van Giersbergen, and Cees Diks. 2023. Removing Spurious Concepts from Neural Network Representations via Joint Subspace Estimation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.11991* (2023).
- [73] Brian Hu, Paul Tunison, Brandon Richard Webster, and Anthony Hoogs. 2023. Xaitk-saliency: An open source explainable ai toolkit for saliency. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 37. 15760–15766.
- [74] Maximilian Idahl, Lijun Lyu, Ujwal Gadiraju, and Avishek Anand. 2021. Towards Benchmarking the Utility of Explanations for Model Debugging. In *Proceedings of the First Workshop on Trustworthy Natural Language Processing*, Yada Pruksachatkun, Anil Ramakrishna, Kai-Wei Chang, Satyapriya Krishna, Jwala Dhamala, Tanaya Guha, and Xiang Ren (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Online.
- [75] Pavel Izmailov, Polina Kirichenko, Nate Gruver, and Andrew G Wilson. 2022. On feature learning in the presence of spurious correlations. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), 38516–38532.
- [76] Arthur Jacot, Franck Gabriel, and Clément Hongler. 2018. Neural tangent kernel: Convergence and generalization in neural networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 31 (2018).
- [77] Zhihua Jin, Xingbo Wang, Furui Cheng, Chunhui Sun, Qun Liu, and Huamin Qu. 2023. ShortcutLens: A visual analytics approach for exploring shortcuts in natural language understanding dataset. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics* (2023).
- [78] Justin Johnson, Bharath Hariharan, Laurens van der Maaten, Li Fei-Fei, C. Lawrence Zitnick, and Ross Girshick. 2016. CLEVR: A Diagnostic Dataset for Compositional Language and Elementary Visual Reasoning. arXiv:1612.06890 [cs.CV]
- [79] Rickard Karlsson and Jesse Krijthe. 2024. Detecting hidden confounding in observational data using multiple environments. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [80] Jacob Kauffmann, Lukas Ruff, Grégoire Montavon, and Klaus-Robert Müller. 2020. The clever Hans effect in anomaly detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.10609* (2020).
- [81] Corentin Kervadec, Grigory Antipov, Moez Baccouche, and Christian Wolf. 2021. Roses are red, violets are blue... but should vqa expect them to?. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2776–2785.
- [82] Nayeong Kim, Juwon Kang, Sungsoo Ahn, Jungseul Ok, and Suha Kwak. 2024. Improving Robustness to Multiple Spurious Correlations by Multi-Objective Optimization. *ICML* (2024).
- [83] John Kirchenbauer, Jonas Geiping, Yuxin Wen, Jonathan Katz, Ian Miers, and Tom Goldstein. 2023. A Watermark for Large Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.10226* (2023).
- [84] Polina Kirichenko, Pavel Izmailov, and Andrew Gordon Wilson. 2022. Last layer re-training is sufficient for robustness to spurious correlations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.02937* (2022).
- [85] Pang Wei Koh, Thao Nguyen, Yew Siang Tang, Stephen Mussmann, Emma Pierson, Been Kim, and Percy Liang. 2020. Concept bottleneck models. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 5338–5348.
- [86] Pang Wei Koh, Shiori Sagawa, Henrik Marklund, Sang Michael Xie, Marvin Zhang, Akshay Balsubramani, Weihua Hu, Michihiro Yasunaga, Richard Lanus Phillips, Irena Gao, Tony Lee, Etienne David, Ian Stavness, Wei Guo, Berton A. Earnshaw, Imran S. Haque, Sara Beery, Jure Leskovec, Anshul Kundaje, Emma Pierson, Sergey Levine, Chelsea Finn, and Percy Liang. 2021. WILDS: A Benchmark of in-the-Wild Distribution Shifts. arXiv:2012.07421 [cs.LG]

- [87] Narine Kokhlikyan, Vivek Miglani, Miguel Martin, Edward Wang, Bilal Alsallakh, Jonathan Reynolds, Alexander Melnikov, Natalia Kliushkina, Carlos Araya, Siqi Yan, et al. 2020. Captum: A unified and generic model interpretability library for pytorch. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.07896* (2020).
- [88] Maurice Kraus, David Steinmann, Antonia Wüst, Andre Kokozinski, and Kristian Kersting. 2024. Right on Time: Revising Time Series Models by Constraining their Explanations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.12921* (2024).
- [89] Meelis Kull and Peter Flach. 2014. Patterns of dataset shift. In *First international workshop on learning over multiple contexts (LMCE) at ECML-PKDD*, Vol. 5.
- [90] Abhinav Kumar, Amit Deshpande, and Amit Sharma. 2024. Causal effect regularization: automated detection and removal of spurious correlations. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [91] JuneHyoungh Kwon, Eunju Lee, Yunsung Cho, and YoungBin Kim. 2024. Learning to Detour: Shortcut Mitigating Augmentation for Weakly Supervised Semantic Segmentation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*. 819–828.
- [92] Tyler LaBonte, Vidya Muthukumar, and Abhishek Kumar. 2024. Towards last-layer retraining for group robustness with fewer annotations. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [93] Lauro Langosco Di Langosco, Jack Koch, Lee D Sharkey, Jacob Pfau, and David Krueger. 2022. Goal Misgeneralization in Deep Reinforcement Learning. In *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning (Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, Vol. 162)*, Kamalika Chaudhuri, Stefanie Jegelka, Le Song, Csaba Szepesvari, Gang Niu, and Sivan Sabato (Eds.). PMLR, 12004–12019.
- [94] Sebastian Lapuschkin, Stephan Wäldchen, Alexander Binder, Grégoire Montavon, Wojciech Samek, and Klaus-Robert Müller. 2019. Unmasking Clever Hans predictors and assessing what machines really learn. *Nature communications* 10, 1 (2019), 1096.
- [95] Jungsoo Lee, Eungyeup Kim, Juyoung Lee, Jihyeon Lee, and Jaegul Choo. 2021. Learning debiased representation via disentangled feature augmentation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 34 (2021), 25123–25133.
- [96] Yoonho Lee, Michelle S Lam, Helena Vasconcelos, Michael S Bernstein, and Chelsea Finn. 2024. Clarify: Improving Model Robustness With Natural Language Corrections. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.03715* (2024).
- [97] Haoxin Li, Yuan Liu, Hanwang Zhang, and Boyang Li. 2023. Mitigating and Evaluating Static Bias of Action Representations in the Background and the Foreground. *arXiv:2211.12883 [cs.CV]*
- [98] Yi Li and Nuno Vasconcelos. 2019. Repair: Removing representation bias by dataset resampling. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 9572–9581.
- [99] Zhiheng Li, Ivan Evtimov, Albert Gordo, Caner Hazirbas, Tal Hassner, Cristian Canton Ferrer, Chenliang Xu, and Mark Ibrahim. 2023. A whac-a-mole dilemma: Shortcuts come in multiples where mitigating one amplifies others. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 20071–20082.
- [100] Zhiheng Li, Anthony Hoogs, and Chenliang Xu. 2022. Discover and mitigate unknown biases with debiasing alternate networks. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 270–288.
- [101] Paul Pu Liang, Chiyu Wu, Louis-Philippe Morency, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. 2021. Towards understanding and mitigating social biases in language models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 6565–6576.
- [102] Weixin Liang and James Zou. 2022. Metashift: A dataset of datasets for evaluating contextual distribution shifts and training conflicts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.06523* (2022).
- [103] Lorenz Linhardt, Klaus-Robert Müller, and Grégoire Montavon. 2024. Preemptively pruning Clever-Hans strategies in deep neural networks. *Information Fusion* 103 (2024), 102094.
- [104] Phillip Lippe, Sara Magliacane, Sindy Löwe, Yuki M Asano, Taco Cohen, and Efstratios Gavves. 2023. BISCUIT: Causal Representation Learning from Binary Interactions. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Ninth Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence (Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, Vol. 216)*. PMLR.
- [105] Kang Liu, Brendan Dolan-Gavitt, and Siddharth Garg. 2018. Fine-Pruning: Defending Against Backdoor Attacks on Deep Neural Networks. In *Research in Attacks, Intrusions, and Defenses (RAID)*, Vol. 11050. 273–294.
- [106] Ruyang Liu, Hao Liu, Ge Li, Haodi Hou, Tinghao Yu, and Tao Yang. 2022. Contextual debiasing for visual recognition with causal mechanisms. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 12755–12765.
- [107] Yuntao Liu, Yang Xie, and Ankur Srivastava. 2017. Neural Trojans. In *2017 IEEE International Conference on Computer Design, ICCD 2017, Boston, MA, USA, November 5-8, 2017*. IEEE Computer Society, 45–48.

- [108] Zhili Liu, Kai Chen, Yifan Zhang, Jianhua Han, Lanqing Hong, Hang Xu, Zhenguo Li, Dit-Yan Yeung, and James Kwok. 2024. Implicit Concept Removal of Diffusion Models. *arXiv:2310.05873 [cs.CV]*
- [109] Ziwei Liu, Ping Luo, Xiaogang Wang, and Xiaoou Tang. 2015. Deep Learning Face Attributes in the Wild. In *Proceedings of International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*.
- [110] Adian Liusie, Vatsal Raina, Vyas Raina, and Mark Gales. 2022. Analyzing Biases to Spurious Correlations in Text Classification Tasks. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Conference of the Asia-Pacific Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 12th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, Yulan He, Heng Ji, Sujian Li, Yang Liu, and Chua-Hui Chang (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [111] Luyang Luo, Dunyuan Xu, Hao Chen, Tien-Tsin Wong, and Pheng-Ann Heng. 2022. Pseudo bias-balanced learning for debiased chest x-ray classification. In *International conference on medical image computing and computer-assisted intervention*. Springer, 621–631.
- [112] Xu Luo, Longhui Wei, Liangjian Wen, Jinrong Yang, Lingxi Xie, Zenglin Xu, and Qi Tian. 2021. Rectifying the shortcut learning of background for few-shot learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 34 (2021), 13073–13085.
- [113] Aengus Lynch, Gbètondji JS Dovonon, Jean Kaddour, and Ricardo Silva. 2023. Spawrious: A benchmark for fine control of spurious correlation biases. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.05470* (2023).
- [114] Chong Ma, Lin Zhao, Yuzhong Chen, Lei Guo, Tuo Zhang, Xintao Hu, Dinggang Shen, Xi Jiang, and Tianming Liu. 2023. Rectify vit shortcut learning by visual saliency. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems* (2023).
- [115] Chong Ma, Lin Zhao, Yuzhong Chen, Sheng Wang, Lei Guo, Tuo Zhang, Dinggang Shen, Xi Jiang, and Tianming Liu. 2023. Eye-gaze-guided vision transformer for rectifying shortcut learning. *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging* 42, 11 (2023), 3384–3394.
- [116] Jie Ma, Pinghui Wang, Dechen Kong, Zewei Wang, Jun Liu, Hongbin Pei, and Junzhou Zhao. 2024. Robust Visual Question Answering: Datasets, Methods, and Future Challenges. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* 46, 8 (2024), 5575–5594.
- [117] Maggie Makar, Ben Packer, Dan Moldovan, Davis Blalock, Yoni Halpern, and Alexander D’Amour. 2022. Causally motivated shortcut removal using auxiliary labels. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*. PMLR, 739–766.
- [118] Chengzhi Mao, Augustine Cha, Amogh Gupta, Hao Wang, Junfeng Yang, and Carl Vondrick. 2021. Generative interventions for causal learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 3947–3956.
- [119] Emanuele Marconato, Stefano Teso, Antonio Vergari, and Andrea Passerini. 2024. Not all neuro-symbolic concepts are created equal: Analysis and mitigation of reasoning shortcuts. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [120] Ninareh Mehrabi, Fred Morstatter, Nripsuta Saxena, Kristina Lerman, and Aram Galstyan. 2021. A survey on bias and fairness in machine learning. *ACM computing surveys (CSUR)* 54, 6 (2021), 1–35.
- [121] Olli Miettinen. 1974. Confounding and effect-modification. *American Journal of Epidemiology* 100, 5 (1974), 350–353.
- [122] Matthias Minderer, Olivier Bachem, Neil Houlsby, and Michael Tschannen. 2020. Automatic shortcut removal for self-supervised representation learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 6927–6937.
- [123] Mazda Moayeri, Wenxiao Wang, Sahil Singla, and Soheil Feizi. 2023. Spuriousity rankings: sorting data to measure and mitigate biases. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2023), 41572–41600.
- [124] Alfredo Morabia. 2011. History of the modern epidemiological concept of confounding. *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health* 65, 4 (2011), 297–300.
- [125] Nicolas M Müller, Simon Roschmann, Shahbaz Khan, Philip Sperl, and Konstantin Böttinger. 2023. Shortcut Detection with Variational Autoencoders. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.04246* (2023).
- [126] Nicolas M Müller, Simon Roschmann, Shahbaz Khan, Philip Sperl, and Konstantin Böttinger. 2024. Shortcut detection with variational autoencoders. In *2024 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)*. IEEE, 1–7.
- [127] Yasmine Mustafa and Tie Luo. 2024. Unmasking Dementia Detection by Masking Input Gradients: A JSM Approach to Model Interpretability and Precision. In *Pacific-Asia Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. Springer, 75–90.

- [128] Leann Myers and Maria J Sirois. 2004. Spearman correlation coefficients, differences between. *Encyclopedia of statistical sciences* 12 (2004).
- [129] Vaishnavh Nagarajan, Anders Andreassen, and Behnam Neyshabur. 2020. Understanding the failure modes of out-of-distribution generalization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.15775* (2020).
- [130] Junhyun Nam, Hyuntak Cha, Sungsoo Ahn, Jaeho Lee, and Jinwoo Shin. 2020. Learning from failure: De-biasing classifier from biased classifier. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33 (2020), 20673–20684.
- [131] Junhyun Nam, Jaehyung Kim, Jaeho Lee, and Jinwoo Shin. 2022. Spread spurious attribute: Improving worst-group accuracy with spurious attribute estimation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.02070* (2022).
- [132] Meike Nauta, Ricky Walsh, Adam Dubowski, and Christin Seifert. 2021. Uncovering and correcting shortcut learning in machine learning models for skin cancer diagnosis. *Diagnostics* 12, 1 (2021), 40.
- [133] Fahimeh Hosseini Noohdani, Parsa Hosseini, Aryan Yazdan Parast, Hamidreza Yaghoubi Araghi, and Mahdieh Soleymani Baghshah. 2024. Decompose-and-Compose: A Compositional Approach to Mitigating Spurious Correlation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 27662–27671.
- [134] Harsha Nori, Samuel Jenkins, Paul Koch, and Rich Caruana. 2019. Interpretml: A unified framework for machine learning interpretability. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.09223* (2019).
- [135] OpenAI. 2024. GPT-4 Technical Report.
- [136] Judea Pearl et al. 2000. Models, reasoning and inference. *Cambridge, UK: CambridgeUniversityPress* 19, 2 (2000), 3.
- [137] Gregory Plumb, Marco Tulio Ribeiro, and Ameet Talwalkar. 2021. Finding and fixing spurious patterns with explanations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.02112* (2021).
- [138] Jorge A Portal-Diaz, Orlando Lovelle-Enríquez, Marlen Perez-Diaz, José D Lopez-Cabrera, Osmany Reyes-Cardoso, and Ruben Orozco-Morales. 2022. New patch-based strategy for COVID-19 automatic identification using chest x-ray images. *Health and Technology* 12, 6 (2022), 1117–1132.
- [139] Ximing Qiao, Yukun Yang, and Hai Li. 2019. Defending Neural Backdoors via Generative Distribution Modeling. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2019, NeurIPS 2019, December 8-14, 2019, Vancouver, BC, Canada*, Hanna M. Wallach, Hugo Larochelle, Alina Beygelzimer, Florence d’Alché-Buc, Emily B. Fox, and Roman Garnett (Eds.). 14004–14013.
- [140] GuanWen Qiu, Da Kuang, and Surbhi Goel. [n. d.]. Complexity Matters: Feature Learning in the Presence of Spurious Correlations. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- [141] Joaquin Quiñero-Candela, Masashi Sugiyama, Anton Schwaighofer, and Neil D Lawrence. 2022. *Dataset shift in machine learning*. Mit Press.
- [142] Ruggero Ragonese, Pietro Morerio, and Vittorio Murino. 2023. Learning unbiased classifiers from biased data with meta-learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 1–9.
- [143] Abhilasha Ravichander, Joe Stacey, and Marek Rei. 2023. When and Why Does Bias Mitigation Work?. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*. 9233–9247.
- [144] Christian Reimers, Jakob Runge, and Joachim Denzler. 2020. Determining the Relevance of Features for Deep Neural Networks. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*.
- [145] Qibing Ren, Yiting Chen, Yichuan Mo, Qitian Wu, and Junchi Yan. 2022. Dice: Domain-attack invariant causal learning for improved data privacy protection and adversarial robustness. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. 1483–1492.
- [146] Caleb Robinson, Anusua Trivedi, Marian Blazes, Anthony Ortiz, Jocelyn Desbiens, Sunil Gupta, Rahul Dodhia, Pavan K Bhatraju, W Conrad Liles, Aaron Lee, et al. 2021. Deep learning models for COVID-19 chest x-ray classification: Preventing shortcut learning using feature disentanglement. *medRxiv* (2021).
- [147] Robin Rombach, Andreas Blattmann, Dominik Lorenz, Patrick Esser, and Björn Ommer. 2022. High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 10684–10695.
- [148] Andrew Slavin Ross, Michael C Hughes, and Finale Doshi-Velez. 2017. Right for the right reasons: Training differentiable models by constraining their explanations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1703.03717* (2017).

- [149] Olga Russakovsky, Jia Deng, Hao Su, Jonathan Krause, Sanjeev Satheesh, Sean Ma, Zhiheng Huang, Andrej Karpathy, Aditya Khosla, Michael Bernstein, Alexander C. Berg, and Li Fei-Fei. 2015. ImageNet Large Scale Visual Recognition Challenge. *International Journal of Computer Vision (IJCV)* 115, 3 (2015), 211–252.
- [150] Shiori Sagawa, Pang Wei Koh, Tatsunori B Hashimoto, and Percy Liang. 2019. Distributionally robust neural networks for group shifts: On the importance of regularization for worst-case generalization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.08731* (2019).
- [151] Shiori Sagawa, Pang Wei Koh, Tony Lee, Irena Gao, Sang Michael Xie, Kendrick Shen, Ananya Kumar, Weihua Hu, Michihiro Yasunaga, Henrik Marklund, Sara Beery, Etienne David, Ian Stavness, Wei Guo, Jure Leskovec, Kate Saenko, Tatsunori Hashimoto, Sergey Levine, Chelsea Finn, and Percy Liang. 2022. Extending the WILDS Benchmark for Unsupervised Adaptation. *arXiv:2112.05090 [cs.LG]*
- [152] Shiori Sagawa, Aditi Raghunathan, Pang Wei Koh, and Percy Liang. 2020. An investigation of why overparameterization exacerbates spurious correlations. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 8346–8356.
- [153] Laasya Samhita and Hans J Gross. 2013. The “clever Hans phenomenon” revisited. *Communicative & integrative biology* 6, 6 (2013), e27122.
- [154] Esha Sarkar, Yousif Alkindi, and Michail Maniatakos. 2020. Backdoor Suppression in Neural Networks using Input Fuzzing and Majority Voting. *IEEE Design & Test* 37, 2 (2020), 103–110.
- [155] Patrick Schramowski, Wolfgang Stammer, Stefano Teso, Anna Brugger, Franziska Herbert, Xiaoting Shao, Hans-Georg Luigs, Anne-Katrin Mahlein, and Kristian Kersting. 2020. Making deep neural networks right for the right scientific reasons by interacting with their explanations. *Nature Machine Intelligence* (2020).
- [156] Christoph Schuhmann, Romain Beaumont, Richard Vencu, Cade Gordon, Ross Wightman, Mehdi Cherti, Theo Coombes, Aarush Katta, Clayton Mullis, Mitchell Wortsman, et al. 2022. Laion-5b: An open large-scale dataset for training next generation image-text models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), 25278–25294.
- [157] Philip Sedgwick. 2012. Pearson’s correlation coefficient. *Bmj* 345 (2012).
- [158] Seonguk Seo, Joon-Young Lee, and Bohyung Han. 2022. Information-theoretic bias reduction via causal view of spurious correlation. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 36. 2180–2188.
- [159] Preethi Seshadri, Sameer Singh, and Yanai Elazar. 2024. The Bias Amplification Paradox in Text-to-Image Generation. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*.
- [160] Amrith Setlur, Saurabh Garg, Virginia Smith, and Sergey Levine. 2024. Prompting is a Double-Edged Sword: Improving Worst-Group Robustness of Foundation Models. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- [161] Xiaoting Shao, Arseny Skryagin, Wolfgang Stammer, Patrick Schramowski, and Kristian Kersting. 2021. Right for better reasons: Training differentiable models by constraining their influence functions. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 35. 9533–9540.
- [162] Ruoqi Shen, Sebastien Bubeck, and Suriya Gunasekar. 2022. Data Augmentation as Feature Manipulation. In *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning (Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, Vol. 162)*, Kamalika Chaudhuri, Stefanie Jegelka, Le Song, Csaba Szepesvari, Gang Niu, and Sivan Sabato (Eds.). PMLR, 19773–19808.
- [163] Robik Shrestha, Kushal Kafle, and Christopher Kanan. 2022. An investigation of critical issues in bias mitigation techniques. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*. 1943–1954.
- [164] Qingyi Si, Fandong Meng, Mingyu Zheng, Zheng Lin, Yuanxin Liu, Peng Fu, Yanan Cao, Weiping Wang, and Jie Zhou. 2022. Language Prior Is Not the Only Shortcut: A Benchmark for Shortcut Learning in VQA. *arXiv:2210.04692 [cs.CV]*
- [165] Karan Sikka, Indranil Sur, Anirban Roy, Ajay Divakaran, and Susmit Jha. 2023. Detecting trojaned dnns using counterfactual attributions. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Assured Autonomy (ICAA)*. IEEE, 76–85.
- [166] David Silver, Aja Huang, Chris J Maddison, Arthur Guez, Laurent Sifre, George Van Den Driessche, Julian Schrittwieser, Ioannis Antonoglou, Veda Panneshelvam, Marc Lanctot, et al. 2016. Mastering the game of Go with deep neural networks and tree search. *nature* 529, 7587 (2016), 484–489.
- [167] David Silver, Thomas Hubert, Julian Schrittwieser, Ioannis Antonoglou, Matthew Lai, Arthur Guez, Marc Lanctot, Laurent Sifre, Dharshan Kumaran, Thore Graepel, et al. 2018. A general reinforcement learning algorithm that masters chess, shogi, and Go through self-play. *Science* 362, 6419 (2018), 1140–1144.

- [168] Peter Spirtes and Kun Zhang. 2016. Causal discovery and inference: concepts and recent methodological advances. In *Applied informatics*, Vol. 3. Springer, 1–28.
- [169] Wolfgang Stammer, Patrick Schramowski, and Kristian Kersting. 2021. Right for the right concept: Revising neuro-symbolic concepts by interacting with their explanations. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 3619–3629.
- [170] Wolfgang Stammer, Antonia Wüst, David Steinmann, and Kristian Kersting. 2024. Neural Concept Binder. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* (2024).
- [171] Ryan Steed, Swetasudha Panda, Ari Kobren, and Michael Wick. 2022. Upstream mitigation is not all you need: Testing the bias transfer hypothesis in pre-trained language models. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. 3524–3542.
- [172] David Steinmann, Wolfgang Stammer, Felix Friedrich, and Kristian Kersting. 2023. Learning to intervene on concept bottlenecks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.13453* (2023).
- [173] Lukas Struppek, Martin B. Hentschel, Clifton Poth, Dominik Hintersdorf, and Kristian Kersting. 2023. Leveraging Diffusion-Based Image Variations for Robust Training on Poisoned Data. *Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS) - Workshop on Backdoors in Deep Learning: The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly* (2023).
- [174] Bob L Sturm. 2014. A simple method to determine if a music information retrieval system is a "horse". *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia* 16, 6 (2014), 1636–1644.
- [175] Zechen Sun, Yisheng Xiao, Juntao Li, Yixin Ji, Wenliang Chen, and Min Zhang. 2024. Exploring and Mitigating Shortcut Learning for Generative Large Language Models. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Joint International Conference on Computational Linguistics, Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC-COLING 2024)*. 6883–6893.
- [176] Harini Suresh and John Gutttag. 2021. A framework for understanding sources of harm throughout the machine learning life cycle. In *Proceedings of the 1st ACM Conference on Equity and Access in Algorithms, Mechanisms, and Optimization*. 1–9.
- [177] Kamil Szyk, Tomasz Walkowiak, and Henryk Maciejewski. 2021. Checking robustness of representations learned by deep neural networks. In *Joint European Conference on Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases*. Springer, 399–414.
- [178] Damien Teney, Ehsan Abbasnejad, and Anton van den Hengel. 2020. Learning what makes a difference from counterfactual examples and gradient supervision. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part X 16*. Springer, 580–599.
- [179] Stefano Teso and Kristian Kersting. 2019. Explanatory interactive machine learning. In *Proceedings of the 2019 AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*. 239–245.
- [180] Kshitiz Tiwari, Shuhan Yuan, and Lu Zhang. 2022. Robust Hate Speech Detection via Mitigating Spurious Correlations. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Conference of the Asia-Pacific Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 12th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 2: Short Papers)*. 51–56.
- [181] Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruiti Bhosale, et al. 2023. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288* (2023).
- [182] Philipp Tschandl, Cliff Rosendahl, and Harald Kittler. 2018. The HAM10000 Dataset: A Large Collection of Multi-Source Dermatoscopic Images of Common Pigmented Skin Lesions. *Scientific Data* 5 (08 2018).
- [183] Victor Veitch, Alexander D’Amour, Steve Yadlowsky, and Jacob Eisenstein. 2021. Counterfactual invariance to spurious correlations in text classification. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 34 (2021), 16196–16208.
- [184] Rahul Venkataramani, Parag Dutta, Vikram Melapudi, and Ambedkar Dukkipati. 2024. Causal Feature Alignment: Learning to Ignore Spurious Background Features. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*. 4666–4674.
- [185] David Wallis and Irène Buvat. 2022. Clever Hans effect found in a widely used brain tumour MRI dataset. *Medical image analysis* 77 (2022), 102368.
- [186] Jinqiang Wang, Rui Hu, Chaoquan Jiang, Rui Hu, and Jitao Sang. 2022. Counterexample Contrastive Learning for Spurious Correlation Elimination. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*. 4930–4938.

- [187] Jiaxuan Wang, Sarah Jabbour, Maggie Makar, Michael Sjoding, and Jenna Wiens. 2022. Learning concept credible models for mitigating shortcuts. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 35 (2022), 33343–33356.
- [188] Shunxin Wang, Christoph Brune, Raymond Veldhuis, and Nicola Strisciuglio. 2023. DFM-X: Augmentation by leveraging prior knowledge of shortcut learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*. 129–138.
- [189] Shunxin Wang, Raymond Veldhuis, Christoph Brune, and Nicola Strisciuglio. 2023. What do neural networks learn in image classification? a frequency shortcut perspective. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*. 1433–1442.
- [190] Xinyi Wang, Wenhu Chen, Michael Saxon, and William Yang Wang. 2021. Counterfactual maximum likelihood estimation for training deep networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 34 (2021), 25072–25085.
- [191] Yining Wang, Junjie Sun, Chenyue Wang, Mi Zhang, and Min Yang. 2024. Navigate Beyond Shortcuts: Debaised Learning through the Lens of Neural Collapse. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 12322–12331.
- [192] Zhao Wang and Aron Culotta. 2021. Robustness to spurious correlations in text classification via automatically generated counterfactuals. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 35. 14024–14031.
- [193] Sheng-Lun Wei, Cheng-Kuang Wu, Hen-Hsen Huang, and Hsin-Hsi Chen. 2024. Unveiling Selection Biases: Exploring Order and Token Sensitivity in Large Language Models. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*.
- [194] Olivia Wiles, Sven Gowal, Florian Stimberg, Sylvestre-Alvise Rebuffi, Ira Ktena, Krishnamurthy Dvijotham, and Ali Taylan Cemgil. 2022. A Fine-Grained Analysis on Distribution Shift. In *The Tenth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2022, Virtual Event, April 25-29, 2022*. OpenReview.net.
- [195] Adina Williams, Nikita Nangia, and Samuel Bowman. 2018. A Broad-Coverage Challenge Corpus for Sentence Understanding through Inference. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long Papers)*, Marilyn Walker, Heng Ji, and Amanda Stent (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, New Orleans, Louisiana.
- [196] Christopher Winship and Robert D Mare. 1992. Models for sample selection bias. *Annual review of sociology* 18, 1 (1992), 327–350.
- [197] Dongxian Wu and Yisen Wang. 2021. Adversarial Neuron Pruning Purifies Backdoored Deep Models. In *Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*. 16913–16925.
- [198] Jiaying Wu and Bryan Hooi. 2022. Probing spurious correlations in popular event-based rumor detection benchmarks. In *Joint European Conference on Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases*. Springer, 274–290.
- [199] Shirley Wu, Mert Yuksekgonul, Linjun Zhang, and James Zou. 2023. Discover and cure: Concept-aware mitigation of spurious correlation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 37765–37786.
- [200] Antonia Wüst, Wolfgang Stammer, Quentin Delfosse, Devendra Singh Dhami, and Kristian Kersting. 2024. Pix2Code: Learning to Compose Neural Visual Concepts as Programs. In *The 40th Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*.
- [201] Han Xiao, Kashif Rasul, and Roland Vollgraf. 2017. *Fashion-MNIST: a Novel Image Dataset for Benchmarking Machine Learning Algorithms*. arXiv:cs.LG/1708.07747 [cs.LG]
- [202] Xiaojun Xu, Qi Wang, Huichen Li, Nikita Borisov, Carl A. Gunter, and Bo Li. 2021. Detecting AI Trojans Using Meta Neural Analysis. In *42nd IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy, SP 2021, San Francisco, CA, USA, 24-27 May 2021*. IEEE, 103–120.
- [203] Mingfu Xue, Yinghao Wu, Zhiyu Wu, Yushu Zhang, Jian Wang, and Weiqiang Liu. 2023. Detecting backdoor in deep neural networks via intentional adversarial perturbations. *Inf. Sci.* 634 (2023), 564–577.
- [204] Siyuan Yan, Zhen Yu, Xuelin Zhang, Dwarikanath Mahapatra, Shekhar S. Chandra, Monika Janda, Peter Soyer, and Zongyuan Ge. 2023. Towards Trustable Skin Cancer Diagnosis via Rewriting Model’s Decision. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. 11568–11577.
- [205] Wanqian Yang, Polina Kirichenko, Micah Goldblum, and Andrew G Wilson. 2022. Chroma-vae: Mitigating shortcut learning with generative classifiers. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), 20351–20365.

- [206] Yu Yang, Eric Gan, Gintare Karolina Dziugaite, and Baharan Mirzasoleiman. 2024. Identifying spurious biases early in training through the lens of simplicity bias. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*. PMLR, 2953–2961.
- [207] Yu Yang, Besmira Nushi, Hamid Palangi, and Baharan Mirzasoleiman. 2023. Mitigating spurious correlations in multi-modal models during fine-tuning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 39365–39379.
- [208] Yao-Yuan Yang, Chi-Ning Chou, and Kamalika Chaudhuri. 2022. Understanding rare spurious correlations in neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.05189* (2022).
- [209] Haotian Ye, James Zou, and Linjun Zhang. 2023. Freeze then train: Towards provable representation learning under spurious correlations and feature noise. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*. PMLR, 8968–8990.
- [210] Wenqian Ye, Guangtao Zheng, Xu Cao, Yunsheng Ma, Xia Hu, and Aidong Zhang. 2024. Spurious Correlations in Machine Learning: A Survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.12715* (2024).
- [211] Sriram Yenamandra, Pratik Ramesh, Viraj Prabhu, and Judy Hoffman. 2023. Facts: First amplify correlations and then slice to discover bias. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*. 4794–4804.
- [212] Yu Yuan, Lili Zhao, Kai Zhang, Guangting Zheng, and Qi Liu. 2024. Do llms overcome shortcut learning? an evaluation of shortcut challenges in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.13343* (2024).
- [213] Yu Yuan, Lili Zhao, Kai Zhang, Guangting Zheng, and Qi Liu. 2024. Do LLMs Overcome Shortcut Learning? An Evaluation of Shortcut Challenges in Large Language Models. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*.
- [214] Samira Zare and Hien Van Nguyen. 2022. Removal of confounders via invariant risk minimization for medical diagnosis. In *International Conference on Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention*. Springer, 578–587.
- [215] John R. Zech, Marcus A. Badgeley, Manway Liu, Anthony B. Costa, Joseph J. Titano, and Eric Karl Oermann. 2018. Variable Generalization Performance of a Deep Learning Model to Detect Pneumonia in Chest Radiographs: A Cross-Sectional Study. *PLOS Medicine* 15, 11 (2018), e1002683.
- [216] Kun Zhang, Shaoan Xie, Ignavier Ng, and Yujia Zheng. 2024. Causal Representation Learning from Multiple Distributions: A General Setting. *arXiv:2402.05052* [cs.LG]
- [217] Lily H Zhang and Rajesh Ranganath. 2023. Robustness to spurious correlations improves semantic out-of-distribution detection. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 37. 15305–15312.
- [218] Min Zhang, Haoxuan Li, Fei Wu, and Kun Kuang. 2024. Metacoco: A new few-shot classification benchmark with spurious correlation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.19644* (2024).
- [219] Xingxuan Zhang, Peng Cui, Renzhe Xu, Linjun Zhou, Yue He, and Zheyang Shen. 2021. Deep stable learning for out-of-distribution generalization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 5372–5382.
- [220] Xiaoyu Zhang, Rohit Gupta, Ajmal Mian, Nazanin Rahnavard, and Mubarak Shah. 2021. Cassandra: Detecting Trojaned Networks From Adversarial Perturbations. *IEEE Access* 9 (2021), 135856–135867.
- [221] Xi Zhang, Feifei Zhang, and Changsheng Xu. 2024. NExT-OOD: Overcoming Dual Multiple-Choice VQA Biases. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* 46, 4 (2024), 1913–1931.
- [222] Jieyu Zhao, Tianlu Wang, Mark Yatskar, Vicente Ordonez, and Kai-Wei Chang. 2017. Men also like shopping: Reducing gender bias amplification using corpus-level constraints. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.09457* (2017).
- [223] Qingyu Zhao, Ehsan Adeli, and Kilian M Pohl. 2020. Training confounder-free deep learning models for medical applications. *Nature communications* 11, 1 (2020), 6010.
- [224] Jiayun Zheng and Maggie Makar. 2022. Causally motivated multi-shortcut identification and removal. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), 12800–12812.
- [225] Chunting Zhou, Xuezhe Ma, Paul Michel, and Graham Neubig. 2021. Examining and combating spurious features under distribution shift. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 12857–12867.