

Model-Free Counterfactual Subset Selection at Scale

Minh Hieu Nguyen, Viet Hung Doan, Anh Tuan Nguyen, Jun Jo, Quoc Viet Hung Nguyen

Abstract

Ensuring transparency in AI decision-making requires interpretable explanations, particularly at the instance level. Counterfactual explanations are a powerful tool for this purpose, but existing techniques frequently depend on synthetic examples, introducing biases from unrealistic assumptions, flawed models, or skewed data. Many methods also assume full dataset availability, an impractical constraint in real-time environments where data flows continuously. In contrast, streaming explanations offer adaptive, real-time insights without requiring persistent storage of the entire dataset. This work introduces a scalable, model-free approach to selecting diverse and relevant counterfactual examples directly from observed data. Our algorithm operates efficiently in streaming settings, maintaining $O(\log k)$ update complexity per item while ensuring high-quality counterfactual selection. Empirical evaluations on both real-world and synthetic datasets demonstrate superior performance over baseline methods, with robust behavior even under adversarial conditions.

1. Introduction

Explainable AI (XAI) is crucial for modern ML [1], driven by legal mandates like GDPR [2] and ethical guidelines. Lack of explainability limits ML adoption in high-stakes areas, where biased models can lead to unfair outcomes such as credit denials or job rejections [3]. Counterfactual explanations address this by showing changes needed to reverse outcomes, offering actionable feedback [4], aligning with GDPR [2], and enabling users to explore “what-if” scenarios, while helping developers debug and monitor models effectively.

Motivating example. Fig. 1 illustrates a skill classification in an automated job application screening program [5]. A candidate was classified by a machine learning model into one of four expertise levels: beginner, intermediate, advanced, and expert. The applicant was classified as a beginner and rejected because an expert was needed. Typically, the company might provide an explanation like “due to poor work experience”, but such explanations do not guide the applicant on how to improve their chances of future acceptance.

Limitations of existing works. (1) Existing methods for counterfactual explanations often focus on binary outcomes (accept/reject) and unrealistic goals, like requiring a PhD, which are impractical for beginners [4]. Focusing on intermediate levels offers more actionable guidance. (2) Most approaches prioritise examples similar to the query, but diverse counterfactuals, such as bootcamps that improve skills in six months, are more beneficial. (3) Many generate synthetic examples [6], which, while sound, can be unrealistic (e.g., an 18-year-old with a PhD). (4) Static, offline methods are unsuitable for streaming data, as they lack the speed and flexibility to generate real-time explanations, such as identifying trends from newly submitted applications.

Contributions. To address these issues, we adopt a model-free approach to generate counterfactuals without requiring access to the original model, ensuring generalizability across domains

(e.g., finance, marketing) and avoiding model-specific limitations [3]. Unlike prior works providing a single counterfactual [7], our method offers multiple alternatives, such as gaining skills, enhancing a portfolio, or adding referees in job applications. It is also free from model bias common in ML models [8]. To handle streaming data and deliver real-time feedback, we use a one-pass streaming algorithm.

In this paper, we propose a unified framework to select a subset of counterfactual examples for a query input, maximizing utility. Our method scales to any data stream size, requiring only a single pass without storing original items. Table 1 compares our approach to state-of-the-art methods, evaluating key features: model access (model-free), example type (real or synthetic), on-the-fly computation (streaming), inclusion of multiple examples (multiplicity), and diversity of examples (diversity).

Table 1: Functionality comparison.

	DICE [9]	MACE [10]	GeCo [4]	CFPlan [11]	FRPD [12]	Ours
Model-free	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Reality	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Streaming	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Multiplicity	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Diversity	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

[†] Although GeCo used genetic algorithm to generate counterfactuals, which is claimed to be diverse, they did not measure it explicitly.




Figure 1: Counterfactual selection

In summary, the contributions of this research include:

- A first system to compute real counterfactual explanations in stream.
- A mitigation of bias when selecting counterfactuals by incorporating multiple concepts of diversity: constraint-based, content-based, class-based, and sampling-based.
- A subset selection problem that balances cardinality, similarity, and diversity for counterfactuals.
- A generic streaming algorithm for counterfactual subset selection that processes the entire data stream in a single pass, achieving a $1/5.585$ quality guarantee with $O(\log k)$ complexity per item.

- Experiments demonstrating our performance across multiple datasets and settings, showing that our approach computes explanations on the fly regardless of data size.

Related work. Recent interest in explanation methods spans interpretable models, rule-based, feature-based, and example-based explanations [1]. Interpretable models (e.g., regressions, decision trees) allow inspection but require ML knowledge and may lack accuracy [9]. Feature-based methods (e.g., LIME, SHAP, LRP) rank feature importance but overlook explanation size, feature dependence, and multi-class predictions [6]. Traditional methods focus on *what happened*, identifying contributing factors, but fail to provide actionable guidance on *what to do next* for outcome improvement, e.g., “poor experience” as a job rejection reason [13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19].

Multiple explanation methods [20] include global model explanations and instance-level predictions [20]. These can be model-specific (intrinsic) or model-agnostic (free). Model-specific methods are efficient and accurate but lack flexibility and generalizability [20], while model-agnostic methods are versatile but may sacrifice performance [20, 7]. Our work advances explanations independent of model evaluations [21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27].

Counterfactual explanations [2, 28, 29] describe how different circumstances could lead to alternative outcomes, offering actionable guidance, such as suggesting a rejected student improve their GRE score or gain research experience [30, 4, 11, 31, 32]. While some methods provide multiple counterfactuals [4, 11], many rely on synthetic examples, which can be unrealistic and less actionable [30, 33]. Humans prefer realistic counterfactuals [29], and methods leveraging feature similarity offer some improvements [34, 35, 36], but they often fall short in feasibility and scalability. Our work addresses these gaps by selecting real counterfactuals, ensuring practical, achievable explanations [37]. In contrast, many existing approaches generate synthetic counterfactuals, including adversarial examples [38], perturbed data points [39], or synthetic case-based examples [40, 41], highlighting the need for methods grounded in real data [42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49].

2. Model and Problem Formulation

Consider a dataset D of n items, where each item has a single label $l = 1, 2, \dots, L$, and D_l denotes the set of items with label l . The groups D_1, \dots, D_L are disjoint, forming $D = D_1 \cup \dots \cup D_L$. The goal is to maximize a non-negative submodular function $f : 2^D \times D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ for a querying item $q \in D$. For simplicity, $f(S)$ is used instead of $f(S, q)$ since q is fixed. Here, $f(\cdot)$ represents a utility function over counterfactual explanations, as detailed in §2.2.

2.1. Counterfactual Diversity

Offering a diverse set of counterfactuals provides opportunities to showcase data items different from the query, enabling users to explore varied explanations and reducing presentation bias [50, 51, 22, 52]. The goal is to ensure every item has an equal chance of selection, regardless of attributes

or class [53, 54, 55]. We propose the following diversity constructs.

Constraint-based diversity. Bias can be mitigated with diversity constraints [56]. Following prior works [57], we define a selection $S \subseteq D$ as constraint-based diverse if it satisfies $\alpha_l \leq |S \cap D_l| \leq \beta_l$, where $\alpha_l, \beta_l \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. These bounds are often proportional to $|D_l|/n$, ensuring balance with respect to label distribution. This definition generalizes bias countermeasures like the 80%-rule and proportional representation [57].

Content-based diversity. This type of diversity aims to eliminate explanations containing many pairs of similar examples. Given a set of data items $S \subseteq D$ and a similarity measure $\text{sim}(\cdot, \cdot)$, an explanation based on content diversity is defined as $-\sum_{e \in S} \sum_{e' \in S} \text{sim}(e, e')$.

Sampling-based diversity. This diversity type addresses sampling bias using a determinantal point process to minimize pairwise similarity. It is represented by the determinant of a distance kernel matrix, $\det(\mathbb{K}_S)$, where $\mathbb{K}_{i,j} = \frac{1}{1+\text{dist}(e_i, e_j)}$ and $\text{dist}(e_i, e_j) = 1 - \text{sim}(e_i, e_j)$. To ensure well-defined determinants, small random perturbations are added to the diagonal elements during computation.

Clustering-based diversity. This diversity metric leverages the clustering nature of items. The local coverage of a data item e over a label l is defined as $(1/2)^{1-\text{sim}(l,e)}$, where $\text{sim}(l, e)$ is the maximum similarity between any item e' of label l and e , and $1/2$ is a decay factor. Based on local coverage, the global coverage of an item e is: $\text{cov}(e) = \sum_{l \in L} (1/2)^{1-\text{sim}(l,e)}$.

The diversity of a set S of items is defined as a weighted sum of coverages:

$$\sum_{e \in S} \text{sim}(e, q) \text{cov}(e) \quad (1)$$

The factor $\text{sim}(e, q)$ avoids selecting items of low relevance but high diversity.

2.2. Counterfactual Utility

With these constructs of diversity, an utility measure for an optimal explanation can now be specified. We propose four measures:

Content-based utility: $f_1(S) = \sum_{e \in S} \text{sim}(e, q) - \frac{\lambda_1}{|S|^2} \sum_e \sum_{e' \neq e} \text{sim}(e, e')$ (2)

The parameter $0 \leq \lambda_1 \leq 1$ balances similarity and diversity, with a larger λ_1 emphasizing diversity. The first term is similar to the proximity in DiCE [9], while the second term is inspired by [13]. This utility favors items that are similar to the query but also different from each other.

Sampling-based utility: $f_2(S) = \sum_{e \in S} \text{sim}(e, q) - \frac{\lambda_2}{|S|} \det(\mathbb{K}_S)$ (3)

The parameter $0 \leq \lambda_2 \leq 1$ balances similarity and diversity. \mathbb{K}_S is a pair-wise matrix of the distance metric for items in S , where $\mathbb{K}_{i,j} = \frac{1}{1+\text{dist}(e_i, e_j)}$ and $\text{dist}(e_i, e_j) = 1 - \text{sim}(e_i, e_j)$. This approach is inspired by DPP [58], which have been used in diversified

sampling.

$$\text{Clustering-based utility: } f_3(S) = \sum_{e \in S} \text{sim}(e, q) + \frac{\lambda_3}{|S|} \sum_{e \in S} \text{sim}(e, q) \text{cov}_\alpha(e) \quad (4)$$

where $0 \leq \lambda_3 \leq 1$ is a parameter to balance the similarity and diversity in an explanation. A larger λ_3 implies the more emphasis on diversity.

$$\text{Hybrid utility: } f(S) = f_1(S) + f_2(S) + f_3(S) \quad (5)$$

2.3. Problem Statement

For each label l , lower and upper bounds (α_l, β_l) define the number of labeled items l required, ensuring constraint-based diversity. With a global cardinality constraint $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, the solution space \mathcal{S} is: $\mathcal{S} = \{S \subseteq D : |S| \leq k, \alpha_l \leq |S \cap D_l| \leq \beta_l, \forall l = 1, \dots, L\}$. In Fig. 1, diversity constraints promote examples with varied features, while the cardinality constraint allows for examples across job levels, catering to user preferences.

Diversified submodular maximisation. Maximizing f under cardinality and diversity constraints involves selecting $S \subseteq D$ with $S \in \mathcal{S}$ to maximize $f(S)$. Let S^* denote the set that maximizes f . We assume a feasible solution exists ($S \neq \emptyset$), ensuring $\sum_{l=1}^L \alpha_l \leq k$. Here, $f(\cdot)$ represents a utility function, not model calls as in prior works [9, 4].

3. One-pass Explanation Algorithm

This section presents our algorithm for counterfactual subset selection in streaming settings, including proof of its approximation guarantee, with the algorithm parsing the data only once. We start with foundational concepts.

3.1. Foundation concepts

Marginal gain. Given two sets $S, S' \subseteq D$, the marginal gain of S with respect to S' is defined as: $f(S|S') = f(S \cup S') - f(S')$, which quantifies the change in value when adding S to S' . The function f is submodular if for any subset $S \subseteq D$ and any item $e \in D \setminus S$, we have: $f(\{e\}|S) \leq f(\{e\})$. This means the marginal gain of any item is less than its value. For brevity, $f(\{e\})$ is written as $f(e)$, $f(\{e\}|S)$ as $f(e|S)$, $S \setminus \{e\}$ as $S \setminus e$, and $S \cup \{e\}$ as $S \cup e$.

Curvature. A lower-bound for the marginal gain is derived by following a curvature of a function f : $\text{cv}(f) = \min\{c : \forall S \subseteq D, \forall e \in D \setminus S, (1 - c)f(e) \leq f(e|S)\}$, where $c \in (0, 1]$. When $c = 0$, f is no longer submodular; rather, it is modular.

Matroids. A family of sets $\mathcal{F} \subseteq 2^D$ is called a matroid if it satisfies: (1) $\mathcal{F} \neq \emptyset$; (2) *Downward-closedness*: if $F_1 \subseteq F_2$ and $F_2 \in \mathcal{F}$, then $F_1 \in \mathcal{F}$; (3) *Augmentation*: if $F_1, F_2 \in \mathcal{F}$ with $|F_1| < |F_2|$, then there exists $e \in F_2$ such that $F_1 \cup \{e\} \in \mathcal{F}$.

Extensibility. A set $S \subseteq D$ is called extensible if it can be a subset of some feasible solution S' . For S to be extensible, it must satisfy the upper bounds $|S| \leq k$ and $|S \cap D_l| \leq \beta_l$ for all $l = 1..L$. This is necessary because S' is already feasible. However, S might violate the lower bounds ($\alpha_l \leq |S \cap D_l|$ for all l), requiring the addition of at least $\alpha_l - |S \cap D_l|$ items of each

label l , which could violate the global cardinality constraint k . Therefore, the necessary and sufficient conditions for a set $S \subseteq D$ to be extensible are: (E1) $|S \cap D_l| \leq \beta_l$ for all $l = 1..L$ and (E2) $\sum_{l=1}^L \max(|S \cap D_l|, \alpha_l) \leq k$.

3.2. Relaxed version

Removing the lower-bound constraints $|S \cap D_l| \geq \alpha_l$ from \mathcal{S} transforms it into a matroid, reducing the problem to submodular maximization under a matroid constraint. The goal is to select $S \subseteq D$ with $S \in \mathcal{F}$ to maximize $f(S)$, where \mathcal{F} is a matroid, requiring a membership function to check $S \in \mathcal{F}$ [59]. We propose a generic greedy streaming algorithm (Alg. 1), inspired by Chakrabarti et al. [59] and Huang et al. [60], as a warm-up for our complete version. Each item e is processed once, computing the marginal gain (Line 3) and checking feasibility (Line 4) under constraints $|S| \leq k$ and $|S \cap D_l| \leq \beta_l$ for all $l = 1..L$. If infeasible, the algorithm swaps e with a candidate e' based on minimal marginal gain (Line 7) and the threshold λ , ensuring e 's gain is at least $1 + \lambda$ times e' 's gain (Line 8). The threshold λ governs quality guarantees.

Quality analysis. In terms of solution quality, Alg. 1 achieves an approximation ratio of $\rho = 2(1 + \lambda)^2/\lambda - \lambda/(1 + \lambda)^2 > 1$, with a minimum value of 7.75 at $\lambda = 1$. This means $f(S) \geq 1/7.75 f(\text{OPT}) \geq 1/\rho f(\text{OPT})$, where OPT is the optimal solution. This is because Alg. 1 is a special case of the problem SOTA for maximum submodular independence set (MSIS), and a solution for MSIS can be transformed into a solution for matroid submodular maximization in constant time [59]. Although these utility functions are well-designed, the approximation ratio can still be further improved.

Algorithm 1 Matroid Submodular Maximisation

Input: D, f, \mathcal{F}

Output: A feasible solution $S \in \mathcal{F}$

```

1:  $S = \emptyset$ 
2: for every arriving item  $e$  do
3:    $w(e) = f(e|S)$ 
4:   if  $S \cup e \in \mathcal{F}$  then
5:      $S = S \cup e$ 
6:   else
7:      $\Delta = \{e' \in S : S \cup e \setminus e' \in \mathcal{F}\}$     $e' = \arg \min_{e' \in \Delta} w(e')$ 
8:     if  $w(e) \geq (1 + \lambda)w(e')$  then
9:        $S = S \cup e \setminus e'$ 
10:    end if
11:  end if
12: end for
13: return  $S$ 

```

To select the best λ for a small k , check if $5.585/(1 - \text{cv}(f)) > 7.75$. If true, set λ to 0.717; otherwise, set it to 1.

Complexity analysis. The complexity of involves runtime, utility calls, matroid queries, and space. Alg. 1 makes two utility calls per item to compute $f(e|S)$. Runtime is dominated by matroid queries, candidate set construction, and minimum selection, implemented in $O(k)$ time and matroid queries, where k is the rank of matroid \mathcal{F} ($|S| \leq k$). Query runtimes depend

on the specific matroid. Space complexity is $O(k)$, as discarded item weights need not be stored.

3.3. The complete algorithm

Intuition. This section outlines the intuition behind our algorithm and introduces the complete algorithm line by line. For practical use, Alg. 1 must function in a black-box manner, though its solution may violate lower-bound constraints. To address this, “backup” items can be gathered in parallel to Alg. 1. As the function is monotone submodular, adding these items preserves the approximation guarantee but may violate the cardinality constraint $|S| \leq k$. Not every set satisfying upper-bound constraints is extensible to a feasible solution, but we show that extendable subsets of D form a matroid, enabling efficient solution.

Putting it all together. Alg. 2 presents a complex algorithm for diversified submodular maximization. It uses Alg. 1, a streaming algorithm for submodular maximization under a matroid constraint, as a black box on the extensibility matroid \hat{S} to construct an extensible set S_1 that approximately maximizes f . In parallel, it collects a preserve set P_l of size $|P_l| = \alpha_l$ for every label l . Finally, the solution S_1 is augmented into a feasible solution S by adding items from P_l to S_1 to satisfy any lower bound constraints where $|S_1 \cap D_l| < \alpha_l$.

Algorithm 2 One-pass explanation algorithm

Input: D, f, S

Output: A feasible solution $S \in \mathcal{S}$

```

1:  $S_1 = \emptyset; P_l = \emptyset, \forall l = 1..L;$ 
2: for every arriving item  $e$  of label  $l$  do
3:   process  $e$  with Alg. 1 ( $D, f, \hat{S}$ )
4:   if  $|P_l| < \alpha_l$  then
5:      $P_l = P_l \cup e$ 
6:   end if
7: end for
8:  $S_1 =$  solution of Alg. 1 ( $D, f, \hat{S}$ )
9:  $S = S_1$  augmented with items in sets  $P_l$ 
10: return  $S$ 

```

Constraint checking. To run Alg. 1 efficiently on the extensibility matroid \hat{S} , we need to check if adding a single item e to an extensible set S maintains extensibility in $O(1)$ time. This is done by maintaining the counts $c_l = |S \cap D_l|$ for each label l in S , and the sum $C = \sum_{l=1}^L \max(c_l, \alpha_l)$. By definition, S is extensible if $c_l \leq \beta_l$ for each l and $C \leq k$. Initially, these variables are set as: (i) $c_l = 0$ for all $l = 1..L$, (ii) $C = \sum_{l=1}^L \alpha_l$. When a potential extension e with label l is considered, the algorithm checks extensibility if $c_l < \alpha_l \vee \alpha_l \leq c_l < \beta_l \wedge C < k$. When S is augmented with e : (i) c_l is incremented by 1, (ii) If $c_l > \alpha_l$, C is incremented by 1.

Quality guarantee. Alg. 2 returns a feasible solution belonging to \mathcal{S} with the same approximation ratio as Alg. 1. First, the feasibility of S is ensured because S_1 is extensible, satisfying the lower-bound constraints without violating the cardinality constraint k . Second, since Alg. 1 is a $1/\rho$ -approximation algorithm, it returns a solution S_1 with a value $f(S_1)$ that is at least

$1/\rho$ times that of the best extensible set. Moreover, $S \subseteq \hat{S}$ by definition, and adding items to S_1 does not decrease $f(\cdot)$ since f is monotone. Thus, the optimal solution in \hat{S} has a value for $f(\cdot)$ greater than or equal to that of the optimal solution in S . Therefore, Alg. 2 maintains the same approximation ratio as Alg. 1.

Runtime and memory. We can further optimize our algorithm to be extremely efficient, using only $O(\log k)$ time per item. The space complexity remains $O(k)$ as Alg. 2 uses extra memory for $|\cup_l P_l| = \sum_l \alpha_l \leq k$. The algorithm still makes two utility calls per item via Alg. 1. Extending the idea in ?? to \mathcal{F} being an extensibility matroid, we maintain a data structure for the query, i.e., $c_l = |S \cap D_l|$ and $C = \sum_{l=1}^L \max(c_l, \alpha_l)$. To find the minimal $w(e')$ among $e' \in \Delta$, which are items $e' \in S$ such that $S \cup e' \setminus e' \in \mathcal{F}$, we check whether a label l' is good. The logic is: (i) If $c_l = \beta_l$, then only l is good. (ii) If $C < k$ or $c_l < \alpha_l$, then every color is good. (iii) Otherwise, good labels are l and those l' with $c_{l'} > \alpha_{l'}$. To quickly find the minimum-weight item with a good label in S , we maintain several priority queues: (i) W , containing S sorted by w . (ii) W_l , for each label l , containing items in $S \cap D_c$ sorted by w . (iii) W' , containing labels with $c_{l'} > \alpha_{l'}$, sorted by $\min_{e' \in S \cap D_{l'}} w(e')$. This data structure can be maintained in $O(\log k)$ time per item while implementing the above logic.

4. Empirical Evaluation

Real datasets. We evaluated our method using three representative datasets:

- *Income* [61]: This dataset contains 45,222 records from the Census database with 14 attributes, including age, race, gender, education, income, occupation, and marital status. Race was selected as the label, ensuring its distribution in S matched the dataset [57]. We set $\alpha_l = \lfloor 0.9 \frac{|D_l|}{|D|} k \rfloor$ and $\beta_l = \lceil 1.1 \frac{|D_l|}{|D|} k \rceil$, varying k .
- *Customer* [62]: This dataset includes phone call records from a bank’s marketing campaign, with features such as client age, gender, account balance, call date, and duration. Age was chosen as the sensitive feature, dividing records into six groups: [0,29] (5273), [30,39] (18,089), [40,49] (11,655), [50,59] (8410), [60,69] (1230), and [70+] (554). Diversity constraints ensured each group formed 10-20% of the subset [57].
- *Lending Credit* [63]: This dataset includes five years of loan data from LendingClub, a peer-to-peer lending platform. After preprocessing [9], we retained 7 features: employment years, annual income, open credit accounts, credit history, home ownership, purpose, and state. The sensitive feature was the loan grade assigned by LendingClub, with diversity constraints ensuring a similar grade distribution.

Synthetic data. We used Synthea [64], a synthetic data generator, to create realistic clinical data for over one million synthetic residents of Massachusetts. This population reflects Massachusetts’ demographics, disease burdens, vaccinations, and

social determinants. Disease modules served as sensitive labels, with diversity constraints ensuring similar disease distributions.

Evaluation metrics. Given their inherent subjectivity, counterfactual examples are challenging to evaluate. While not intended to replace behavioral experiments, we formulated three metrics:

- *Transport cost*: This distance-based cost measure indexes the usefulness of counterfactual examples. Users prefer counterfactual examples similar to the query example, minimizing the effort required to achieve a desired class outcome in another feature.

$$cost = \frac{1}{|S|} \sum_{e \in S} d_{con}(e, q) + d_{cat}(e, q) \quad (6)$$

where $d_{con}(e, q)$ is the l_1 -distance across continuous features between e and q . $d_{cat}(e, q)$ is the l_1 -distance between e and q across their categorical features.

- *No. constraint violation*: This metric counts the number of diversity constraint violations during streaming, reflecting the plausibility of outcomes. Smaller values indicate reduced bias. As our work addresses presentation bias rather than algorithmic bias [8], fairness metrics like equalized odds and statistical parity are not applicable, as they target entire datasets rather than individual explanations [8].
- *Runtime*: measures the total running time of the explanation process.

Baselines. The following baselines were proposed:

- *Offline*: This baseline processes the entire data stream with multiple passes, solving the subset selection problem. In each pass, it selects the item e with maximal marginal gain $f(e|S)$ such that $S \cup e$ remains extensible [57]. The algorithm achieves a $1/2$ -approximation with a runtime of $O(|D|k)$ and $O(|D|k)$ oracle calls.
- *kNN*: This non-streaming baseline processes the entire data stream using nearest-neighbor search [41]. Given disjoint groups D_1, \dots, D_L with the same label (§2), the algorithm rotates between groups, selecting the most similar item and removing it for the next rotation, skipping groups if label cardinality constraints are violated. The kNN time complexity is $O(k|D|)$, reducible to $O(k \log |D|)$ using structures like R-Tree, though tree construction requires $O(|D| \log |D|)$.
- *Random*: This baseline is designed to maintain a random feasible solution. The process is similar to Alg. 2, but the swapping mechanism is performed randomly instead of using the greedy threshold λ , i.e., every arriving time e' has a 0.5 chance of being swapped with a random item in S .
- *Relaxed*: This is the relaxed version of our algorithm, which removes the lower-bound constraints.
- *NoConstraint*: This is the state-of-the-art streaming submodular maximisation algorithm without any diversity constraints [65].


State-of-the-art methods for counterfactual explanation [30, 4, 11] focus on generating synthetic examples, while our method provides real examples [32, 34, 66, 67], making these approaches

orthogonal to ours [68, 31]. Our work emphasizes efficient computation with a quality approximation guarantee. Including these methods [69, 41, 40, 38, 39] would be unfair and potentially misleading.

Environment. All experiments were on an Intel i7 system (3.4GHz, 12GB RAM). The results are averaged over 10 runs (variances reported if appropriate).


4.1. End-to-end Comparisons

Transport cost. We compared our approach to baselines for generating user-friendly counterfactual examples using real datasets. Fig. 2 presents the results, with the X-axis showing the explanation size (k) and the Y-axis the transport cost as l_1 -distance. Our method outperformed streaming baselines (*Random*, *Relaxed*, *NoConstraint*) and the non-streaming baseline (*kNN*), matching the offline algorithm in some cases. For example, in the Customer dataset ($k = 10$), our approach reduced transport costs by up to 33.18%, meaning users exerted only two-thirds the effort to follow recommendations.



(a) Income dataset. (b) Customer dataset. (c) Credit dataset.
Figure 2: Effectiveness for real-world data.


Constraint violations. We evaluated the plausibility of counterfactual explanations by comparing constraint violations across real datasets. Fig. 3 shows results, with the X-axis indicating the number of counterfactual examples (k) and the Y-axis the number of constraint violations. Our approach, like the *offline* algorithm, had no violations (not shown for brevity). The *Relaxed* version had some violations but far fewer than baselines such as *Random*, *kNN*, and *NoConstraint*, which reached violation levels proportional to dataset size due to ignoring diversity constraints.



(a) Income dataset. (b) Customer dataset. (c) Credit dataset.
Figure 3: Constraint Violations in explanations.

Runtime. We evaluated the total runtime of our approach against baselines. Non-streaming methods, such as *offline* and *kNN*, had significantly longer runtimes and are excluded for clarity. Fig. 4a, 4b, and 4c present results, with the X-axis showing the explanation size (k) and the Y-axis the runtime. We varied k up to 25 due to cognitive load limits. While our approach

was slower than other baselines, maintaining additional structures and constraints, its runtime remained under 1 second, suitable for streaming. The framework computes explanations in $O(\log k)$ per item (amortized), yielding $O(n \log k)$ for data size $|D| = n$. In Fig. 4d, using Massachusetts synthetic data (sizes 1M-5M, $k = 1000$), our method demonstrated the most efficient amortized time, $O(\log k)$ per new item, regardless of data size.



(a) Income. (b) Customer. (c) Credit. (d) Massachusetts.
Figure 4: Runtime on different datasets.

4.2. Ablation Study

We evaluated our design choices by comparing variations of our approach: (i) *w/o sketch* – no caching of utility values or constraint checks; (ii) *w/o lower-bound* – ignores lower-bound constraints α_i ; (iii) *w/o upper-bound* – uses only a k -uniform matroid instead of the extensibility matroid; (iv) *greedy threshold* – fixes the threshold λ . Table 2 summarizes the results. Without sketches, runtime increased due to frequent utility evaluations and checks. Relaxing constraints improved utility and transport cost but increased violations. Fixing λ reduced example quality. Notably, $\lambda = 1$ matches the SOTA streaming algorithm for submodular maximization under fairness constraints [57].


Table 2: Importance of each model component.

full model	Δ -Utility	Δ -Transport Cost	Δ -Constraint violations	Δ -Running time
w/o sketch	+0%	+0%	+0%	+893.25%
w/o lower-bound	+5.81%	-2.75%	+21.76%	-12.41%
w/o upper-bound	+4.69%	-1.58%	+33.54%	-18.96%
$\lambda = 0.5$	-5.07%	+12.78%	+0%	+0%
$\lambda = 1$ ([57])	-5.91%	+11.32%	+0%	+0%
$\lambda = 2$	-9.72%	+19.64%	+0%	+0%

4.3. Robustness Analysis

Sliding windows. We evaluated the effect of streaming progress on utility by comparing our approach with its “batch” version using sliding windows of size $|b|$, where $b = \{e_1, \dots, e_{|b|}\}$ is fed to the algorithm. The algorithm selects a subset S' of $S \cup b$ (size k) with the highest $f(S')$, retaining only S' per iteration. Fig. 5 shows results, with the X-axis as the percentage of data processed and the Y-axis as utility change. Utility increases with data stream progress, confirming the algorithm’s soundness. Larger windows ($|b| = 5, 10$) initially increase utility faster (up to 40-60%) as subsets are retained, but the original approach ($|b| = 1$) eventually outperforms due to lower regret from discarding key items as similarity distributions emerge.

Concept drifts. We evaluated the robustness of streaming algorithms to concept drift using synthetic data with varied label distributions: (i) *normal* – future label distributions similar to the past, and (ii) *skewed* – future label distributions significantly



(a) Income dataset. (b) Customer dataset. (c) Credit dataset.
Figure 5: Effects of streaming data on explanation.

Table 3: Explanation utility in adverse conditions.

Feature dist.	Label dist.	Counterfactual									
		Age	Education	Occupation	Work class	Status	Race	Hispanic	Income		
normal	normal	37	College	Exec-managerial	Adm-clerk	State-gov	Private	Married	White	40	<<50K
	skewed	37	College	Exec-managerial	Adm-clerk	State-gov	Private	Married	Black	80	>50K
	skewed	30	Bachelors	Prof-specialty	State-gov	Married	Asian	40	>50K		
skewed	normal	40	Assoc-voc	Craft-repair	Private	Married	Islander	60	>50K		
	skewed	40	Assoc-voc	Craft-repair	Private	Married	Islander	60	>50K		

Figure 6: Examples of counterfactuals.

different. Similarly, item feature distributions were *normal* or *skewed*. Table 3 shows the utility difference between baselines and our algorithm. The relaxed version performed the same as the complete algorithm and is omitted for brevity. Our algorithm remained robust under adversarial conditions, with a maximum degradation of 5.14%, compared to up to 62.64% for baselines in the worst case (skewed feature and class distributions). This robustness stems from maintaining diversity in label constraints and item features.

Case Study. Fig. 6 illustrates the querying input and counterfactuals ($k = 3$) returned by our approach on the Income dataset. The results show a diverse yet relevant set of counterfactual examples. While our work focuses on efficiently computing these explanations, evaluating their usefulness requires user studies, which is beyond the scope of this paper.

5. Conclusion

We explored counterfactual explanations without relying on predictive models, minimizing bias and ensuring broader applicability. By prioritizing both label diversity and feature variability, our approach offers users more actionable pathways to influence outcomes. We formulated the problem as a subset selection task, balancing similarity and diversity while maintaining computational efficiency. To achieve this, we developed a scalable streaming algorithm capable of handling large, continuously arriving datasets without storing the full data history. Empirical results on real and synthetic datasets indicate our method reduces user effort by up to 33%, enhances utility by 57.5%, and improves data stream efficiency by a factor of 25. Future work can extend the framework to multi-label and fairness-aware counterfactual selection, ensuring broader applicability while mitigating biases in decision-making [70, 53, 71, 72, 73, 74]. Enhancing adversarial robustness and energy-efficient processing would make the approach more reliable in real-time, resource-constrained environments such as edge devices [75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81]. Additionally, exploring human-in-the-loop feedback, graph-based selection, and distributed processing could improve interpretability, scalability, and adaptability across diverse domains like healthcare, finance, and criminal justice [82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88].

References

- [1] R. Dwivedi, D. Dave, H. Naik, S. Singhal, R. Omer, P. Patel, B. Qian, Z. Wen, T. Shah, G. Morgan, et al., Explainable ai (xai): Core ideas, techniques, and solutions, *CSUR* 55 (2023) 1–33.
- [2] S. Wachter, et al., Counterfactual explanations without opening the black box: Automated decisions and the gdpr, *Harv. JL & Tech.* 31 (2017) 841.
- [3] S. Barocas, A. D. Selbst, M. Raghavan, The hidden assumptions behind counterfactual explanations and principal reasons, in: *FACCT*, 2020, pp. 80–89.
- [4] M. Schleich, Z. Geng, Y. Zhang, D. Suciu, Geco: Quality counterfactual explanations in real time, *PVLDB* 14 (2021) 1681–1693.
- [5] K. Kirkpatrick, Battling algorithmic bias: how do we ensure algorithms treat us fairly?, *CACM* 59 (2016) 16–17.
- [6] A.-H. Karimi, G. Barthe, B. Schölkopf, I. Valera, A survey of algorithmic recourse: contrastive explanations and consequential recommendations, *CSUR* (2020).
- [7] T. Vermeire, D. Martens, Explainable image classification with evidence counterfactual, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.07511* (2020).
- [8] N. Mehrabi, F. Morstatter, N. Saxena, K. Lerman, A. Galstyan, A survey on bias and fairness in machine learning, *CSUR* 54 (2021) 1–35.
- [9] R. K. Mothilal, A. Sharma, C. Tan, Explaining machine learning classifiers through diverse counterfactual explanations, in: *FACCT*, 2020, pp. 607–617.
- [10] A.-H. Karimi, G. Barthe, B. Balle, I. Valera, Model-agnostic counterfactual explanations for consequential decisions, in: *AISTATS*, 2020, pp. 895–905.
- [11] N. Bui, D. Nguyen, V. A. Nguyen, Counterfactual plans under distributional ambiguity, in: *ICLR*, 2022.
- [12] D. Nguyen, N. Bui, V. A. Nguyen, Feasible recourse plan via diverse interpolation, in: *AISTATS*, 2023, pp. 4679–4698.
- [13] T. T. Nguyen, Q. V. H. Nguyen, M. Weidlich, K. Aberer, Result selection and summarization for web table search, in: *ICDE*, 2015, pp. 231–242.
- [14] T. T. Nguyen, C. T. Duong, M. Weidlich, H. Yin, Q. V. H. Nguyen, Retaining data from streams of social platforms with minimal regret, in: *IJCAI*, 2017, pp. 2850–2856.
- [15] N. T. Tam, M. Weidlich, B. Zheng, H. Yin, N. Q. V. Hung, B. Stantic, From anomaly detection to rumour detection using data streams of social platforms, *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 12 (2019) 1016–1029.
- [16] T. T. Nguyen, T. D. Hoang, M. T. Pham, T. T. Vu, T. H. Nguyen, Q.-T. Huynh, J. Jo, Monitoring agriculture areas with satellite images and deep learning, *Applied Soft Computing* 95 (2020) 106565.
- [17] T. T. Nguyen, M. Weidlich, H. Yin, B. Zheng, Q. V. H. Nguyen, B. Stantic, User guidance for efficient fact checking, *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 12 (2019) 850–863.
- [18] N. T. Tam, H. T. Trung, H. Yin, T. Van Vinh, D. Sakong, B. Zheng, N. Q. V. Hung, Entity alignment for knowledge graphs with multi-order convolutional networks, *TKDE* 34 (2022) 4201–4214.
- [19] T. T. Nguyen, M. T. Pham, T. T. Nguyen, T. T. Huynh, Q. V. H. Nguyen, T. T. Quan, et al., Structural representation learning for network alignment with self-supervised anchor links, *Expert Systems with Applications* 165 (2021) 113857.
- [20] I. Stepin, J. M. Alonso, A. Catala, M. Pereira-Fariña, A survey of contrastive and counterfactual explanation generation methods for explainable artificial intelligence, *IEEE Access* 9 (2021) 11974–12001.
- [21] C. T. Duong, T. T. Nguyen, H. Yin, M. Weidlich, T. S. Mai, K. Aberer, Q. V. H. Nguyen, Efficient and effective multi-modal queries through heterogeneous network embedding, *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* 34 (2022) 5307–5320.
- [22] T. T. Nguyen, M. Weidlich, H. Yin, B. Zheng, Q. H. Nguyen, Q. V. H. Nguyen, Factcatch: Incremental pay-as-you-go fact checking with minimal user effort, in: *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, 2020, pp. 2165–2168.
- [23] N. Q. V. Hung, D. C. Thang, N. T. Tam, M. Weidlich, K. Aberer, H. Yin, X. Zhou, Answer validation for generic crowdsourcing tasks with minimal efforts, *The VLDB Journal* 26 (2017) 855–880.
- [24] Q. V. H. Nguyen, C. T. Duong, T. T. Nguyen, M. Weidlich, K. Aberer, H. Yin, X. Zhou, Argument discovery via crowdsourcing, *The VLDB Journal* 26 (2017) 511–535.
- [25] Z. Ren, T. T. Nguyen, W. Nejdl, Prototype learning for interpretable respiratory sound analysis, in: *Proc. ICASSP*, 2022, pp. 9087–9091.
- [26] Q. V. H. Nguyen, K. Zheng, M. Weidlich, B. Zheng, H. Yin, T. T. Nguyen, B. Stantic, What-if analysis with conflicting goals: Recommending data ranges for exploration, in: *ICDE*, 2018, pp. 89–100.
- [27] N. T. Toan, P. T. Cong, N. T. Tam, N. Q. V. Hung, B. Stantic, Diversifying group recommendation, *IEEE Access* 6 (2018) 17776–17786.
- [28] S. Verma, V. Boonsanong, M. Hoang, K. E. Hines, J. P. Dickerson, C. Shah, Counterfactual explanations and algorithmic recourses for machine learning: A review, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.10596* (2020).
- [29] R. M. Byrne, Counterfactuals in explainable artificial intelligence (xai): Evidence from human reasoning., in: *IJCAI*, 2019, pp. 6276–6282.
- [30] S. Mertes, T. Huber, K. Weitz, A. Heimerl, E. André, Gantefactual—counterfactual explanations for medical non-experts using generative adversarial learning, *Frontiers in artificial intelligence* 5 (2022) 825565.
- [31] J. Ma, R. Guo, S. Mishra, A. Zhang, J. Li, CLEAR: generative counterfactual explanations on graphs, in: *NeurIPS*, 2022.
- [32] S. Dutta, J. Long, S. Mishra, C. Tilli, D. Magazzeni, Robust counterfactual explanations for tree-based ensembles, in: *ICML*, volume 162, 2022, pp. 5742–5756.
- [33] B. Ustun, A. Spangher, Y. Liu, Actionable recourse in linear classification, in: *FAT**, 2019, pp. 10–19.
- [34] A. Van Looveren, J. Klaise, Interpretable counterfactual explanations guided by prototypes, in: *ECML PKDD*, 2021, pp. 650–665.
- [35] R. Poyiadzi, K. Sokol, R. Santos-Rodriguez, T. De Bie, P. Flach, Face: feasible and actionable counterfactual explanations, in: *AIES*, 2020, pp. 344–350.
- [36] K. Kanamori, et al., Dace: Distribution-aware counterfactual explanation by mixed-integer linear optimization., in: *IJCAI*, 2020, pp. 2855–2862.
- [37] J. Höllig, A. F. Markus, et al., Semantic meaningfulness: Evaluating counterfactual approaches for real-world plausibility and feasibility, in: *xAI*, 2023, pp. 636–659.
- [38] J. Moore, N. Hammerla, C. Watkins, Explaining deep learning models with constrained adversarial examples, in: *PRICAI*, 2019, pp. 43–56.
- [39] M. T. Lash, Q. Lin, N. Street, J. G. Robinson, J. Ohlmann, Generalized inverse classification, in: *SDM*, 2017, pp. 162–170.
- [40] E. M. Kenny, M. T. Keane, On generating plausible counterfactual and semi-factual explanations for deep learning, in: *AAAI*, volume 35, 2021, pp. 11575–11585.
- [41] M. T. Keane, B. Smyth, Good counterfactuals and where to find them: A case-based technique for generating counterfactuals for explainable ai (xai), in: *ICCB*, 2020, pp. 163–178.
- [42] B. Zhao, H. van der Aa, T. T. Nguyen, Q. V. H. Nguyen, M. Weidlich, Eires: Efficient integration of remote data in event stream processing, in: *Proceedings of the 2021 International Conference on Management of Data*, 2021, pp. 2128–2141.
- [43] T. T. Huynh, C. T. Duong, T. T. Nguyen, V. T. Van, A. Sattar, H. Yin, Q. V. H. Nguyen, Network alignment with holistic embeddings, *TKDE* 35 (2021) 1881–1894.
- [44] C. T. Duong, T. T. Nguyen, T.-D. Hoang, H. Yin, M. Weidlich, Q. V. H. Nguyen, Deep mcut: Learning node embeddings from detecting communities, *Pattern Recognition* (2022) 109126.
- [45] T. T. Nguyen, T. C. Phan, M. H. Nguyen, M. Weidlich, H. Yin, J. Jo, Q. V. H. Nguyen, Model-agnostic and diverse explanations for streaming rumour graphs, *Knowledge-Based Systems* 253 (2022) 109438.
- [46] T. T. Nguyen, T. T. Huynh, H. Yin, M. Weidlich, T. T. Nguyen, T. S. Mai, Q. V. H. Nguyen, Detecting rumours with latency guarantees using massive streaming data, *The VLDB Journal* (2022) 1–19.
- [47] H. T. Trung, T. Van Vinh, N. T. Tam, J. Jo, H. Yin, N. Q. V. Hung, Learning holistic interactions in lbsns with high-order, dynamic, and multi-role contexts, *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* 35 (2022) 5002–5016.
- [48] T. T. Huynh, M. H. Nguyen, T. T. Nguyen, P. L. Nguyen, M. Weidlich, Q. V. H. Nguyen, K. Aberer, Efficient integration of multi-order dynamics and internal dynamics in stock movement prediction, in: *Proceedings of the Sixteenth ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*, 2023, pp. 850–858.
- [49] D. C. Thang, H. T. Dat, N. T. Tam, J. Jo, N. Q. V. Hung, K. Aberer, Nature vs. nurture: Feature vs. structure for graph neural networks, *PRL* 159 (2022) 46–53.
- [50] T. T. Nguyen, T. C. Phan, Q. V. H. Nguyen, K. Aberer, B. Stantic, Maximal fusion of facts on the web with credibility guarantee, *Information*

- Fusion 48 (2019) 55–66.
- [51] T. T. Nguyen, T. T. Nguyen, T. T. Nguyen, B. Vo, J. Jo, Q. V. H. Nguyen, *Judo: Just-in-time rumour detection in streaming social platforms*, *Information Sciences* 570 (2021) 70–93.
- [52] T. T. Nguyen, T. T. Huynh, P. L. Nguyen, A. W.-C. Liew, H. Yin, Q. V. H. Nguyen, *A survey of machine unlearning*, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.02299* (2022).
- [53] T. T. Nguyen, N. Quoc Viet Hung, T. T. Nguyen, T. T. Huynh, T. T. Nguyen, M. Weidlich, H. Yin, *Manipulating recommender systems: A survey of poisoning attacks and countermeasures*, *ACM Computing Surveys* 57 (2024) 1–39.
- [54] T. T. Nguyen, T. T. Huynh, M. T. Pham, T. D. Hoang, T. T. Nguyen, Q. V. H. Nguyen, *Validating functional redundancy with mixed generative adversarial networks*, *Knowledge-Based Systems* 264 (2023) 110342.
- [55] T. T. Nguyễn, *Debunking Misinformation on the Web: Detection, Validation, and Visualisation*, Technical Report, EPFL, 2019.
- [56] C. Russell, *Efficient search for diverse coherent explanations*, in: *FAccT*, 2019, pp. 20–28.
- [57] M. E. Halabi, S. Mitrovic, A. Norouzi-Fard, J. Tardos, et al., *Fairness in streaming submodular maximization: Algorithms and hardness*, in: *NIPS*, 2020, pp. 1–14.
- [58] A. Kulesza, B. Taskar, et al., *Determinantal point processes for machine learning*, *FTML* 5 (2012) 123–286.
- [59] A. Chakrabarti, S. Kale, *Submodular maximization meets streaming: Matchings, matroids, and more*, *Math. Program.* 154 (2015) 225–247.
- [60] C.-C. Huang, N. Kakimura, S. Mauras, Y. Yoshida, *Approximability of monotone submodular function maximization under cardinality and matroid constraints in the streaming model*, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.05477* (2020).
- [61] E. Celis, V. Keswani, D. Straszak, A. Deshpande, T. Kathuria, N. Vishnoi, *Fair and diverse dpp-based data summarization*, in: *ICML*, 2018, pp. 716–725.
- [62] S. Moro, P. Cortez, P. Rita, *A data-driven approach to predict the success of bank telemarketing*, *Decision Support Systems* 62 (2014) 22–31.
- [63] K. Davenport, *Lending club data analysis revisited with python*, 2015.
- [64] J. Chen, D. Chun, M. Patel, E. Chiang, J. James, *The validity of synthetic clinical data: a validation study of a leading synthetic data generator (synthea) using clinical quality measures*, *MIDM* 19 (2019) 1–9.
- [65] A. Badanidiyuru, B. Mirzasoleiman, A. Karbasi, et al., *Streaming submodular maximization: Massive data summarization on the fly*, in: *KDD*, 2014, pp. 671–680.
- [66] D. Ley, U. Bhatt, A. Weller, *Diverse, global and amortised counterfactual explanations for uncertainty estimates*, in: *AAAI*, 2022, pp. 7390–7398.
- [67] M. Pawelczyk, T. Datta, J. van den Heuvel, G. Kasneci, H. Lakkaraju, *Probabilistically robust recourse: Navigating the trade-offs between costs and robustness in algorithmic recourse*, in: *ICLR*, 2023.
- [68] R. Guidotti, *Counterfactual explanations and how to find them: literature review and benchmarking*, *DataMine* (2022) 1–55.
- [69] R. Guidotti, S. Ruggieri, *Ensemble of counterfactual explainers*, in: *DS*, 2021, pp. 358–368.
- [70] T. T. Nguyen, Z. Ren, T. Pham, P. L. Nguyen, H. Yin, Q. V. H. Nguyen, *Instruction-guided editing controls for images and multimedia: A survey in llm era*, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.09955* (2024).
- [71] T. T. Nguyen, T. T. Huynh, Z. Ren, T. T. Nguyen, P. L. Nguyen, H. Yin, Q. V. H. Nguyen, *Privacy-preserving explainable ai: a survey*, *Science China Information Sciences* 68 (2025) 111101.
- [72] M. T. Pham, T. T. Huynh, T. T. Nguyen, T. T. Nguyen, T. T. Nguyen, J. Jo, H. Yin, Q. V. H. Nguyen, *A dual benchmarking study of facial forgery and facial forensics*, *CAAI Transactions on Intelligence Technology* 9 (2024) 1377–1397.
- [73] D. D. A. Nguyen, M. H. Nguyen, P. L. Nguyen, J. Jo, H. Yin, T. T. Nguyen, *Multi-task learning of heterogeneous hypergraph representations in lbsns*, in: *International Conference on Advanced Data Mining and Applications*, Springer, 2024, pp. 161–177.
- [74] T. T. Nguyen, T. T. Nguyen, M. Weidlich, J. Jo, Q. V. H. Nguyen, H. Yin, A. W.-C. Liew, *Handling low homophily in recommender systems with partitioned graph transformer*, *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* (2024).
- [75] T. Nguyen Thanh, N. D. K. Quach, T. T. Nguyen, T. T. Huynh, V. H. Vu, P. L. Nguyen, J. Jo, Q. V. H. Nguyen, *Poisoning gnn-based recommender systems with generative surrogate-based attacks*, *ACM Transactions on Information Systems* 41 (2023) 1–24.
- [76] T. T. Nguyen, T. C. Phan, H. T. Pham, T. T. Nguyen, J. Jo, Q. V. H. Nguyen, *Example-based explanations for streaming fraud detection on graphs*, *Information Sciences* 621 (2023) 319–340.
- [77] Q. V. H. Nguyen, T. Nguyen Thanh, Z. Miklós, K. Aberer, *Reconciling schema matching networks through crowdsourcing*, *EAI Endorsed Transactions on Collaborative Computing* 1 (2014) e2.
- [78] Q. V. H. Nguyen, T. T. Nguyen, V. T. Chau, T. K. Wijaya, Z. Miklós, K. Aberer, A. Gal, M. Weidlich, *Smart: A tool for analyzing and reconciling schema matching networks*, in: *ICDE*, 2015, pp. 1488–1491.
- [79] D. C. Thang, N. T. Tam, N. Q. V. Hung, K. Aberer, *An evaluation of diversification techniques*, in: *DEXA*, 2015, pp. 215–231.
- [80] Q. V. H. Nguyen, S. T. Do, T. T. Nguyen, K. Aberer, *Tag-based paper retrieval: minimizing user effort with diversity awareness*, in: *DASFAA*, 2015, pp. 510–528.
- [81] N. Q. V. Hung, M. Weidlich, N. T. Tam, Z. Miklós, K. Aberer, A. Gal, B. Stantic, *Handling probabilistic integrity constraints in pay-as-you-go reconciliation of data models*, *Information Systems* 83 (2019) 166–180.
- [82] C. Yang, W. Yuan, L. Qu, T. T. Nguyen, *Pdc-frs: Privacy-preserving data contribution for federated recommender system*, in: *International Conference on Advanced Data Mining and Applications*, Springer, 2024, pp. 65–79.
- [83] D. Sakong, V. H. Vu, T. T. Huynh, P. Le Nguyen, H. Yin, Q. V. H. Nguyen, T. T. Nguyen, *Higher-order knowledge-enhanced recommendation with heterogeneous hypergraph multi-attention*, *Information Sciences* 680 (2024) 121165.
- [84] T. T. Huynh, T. B. Nguyen, P. L. Nguyen, T. T. Nguyen, M. Weidlich, Q. V. H. Nguyen, K. Aberer, *Fast-fedul: A training-free federated unlearning with provable skew resilience*, in: *Joint European Conference on Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases*, Springer, 2024, pp. 55–72.
- [85] T. T. Huynh, T. B. Nguyen, T. T. Nguyen, P. L. Nguyen, H. Yin, Q. V. H. Nguyen, T. T. Nguyen, *Certified unlearning for federated recommendation*, *ACM Transactions on Information Systems* (2025).
- [86] T. T. Nguyen, T. T. Nguyen, T. H. Nguyen, H. Yin, T. T. Nguyen, J. Jo, Q. V. H. Nguyen, *Isomorphic graph embedding for progressive maximal frequent subgraph mining*, *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology* 15 (2023) 1–26.
- [87] T. T. Nguyen, Z. Ren, T. T. Nguyen, J. Jo, Q. V. H. Nguyen, H. Yin, *Portable graph-based rumour detection against multi-modal heterophily*, *Knowledge-Based Systems* 284 (2024) 111310.
- [88] Z. Ren, Y. Chang, T. T. Nguyen, Y. Tan, K. Qian, B. W. Schuller, *A comprehensive survey on heart sound analysis in the deep learning era*, *IEEE Computational Intelligence Magazine* 19 (2024) 42–57.