

Finding Linear Explanations for a Given Ranking

Zixuan Chen
Northeastern University
Boston, USA
chen.zixu@northeastern.edu

Panagiotis Manolios
Northeastern University
Boston, USA
p.manolios@northeastern.edu

Mirek Riedewald
Northeastern University
Boston, USA
m.riedewald@northeastern.edu

ABSTRACT

Given a relation and a ranking of its tuples, but no information about the ranking function, we propose RANKEXPLAIN to solve 2 types of problems: SAT asks if any linear scoring function can exactly reproduce the given ranking. OPT identifies the linear scoring function that minimizes position-based error, i.e., the total of the ranking-position differences over all tuples in the top- k . Our solution consists of linear programs that solve the problems exactly and can be implemented using MILP solvers. These solvers also support additional constraints on the scoring function, allowing the user to explore competing hypotheses through alternative scoring functions. We also discuss techniques for dealing with numerical imprecision and for improving performance and scalability. Experiments demonstrate that RANKEXPLAIN can solve realistic problems. It is the first technique to provide exact solutions for OPT; and it is the fastest in producing exact solutions for SAT.

PVLDB Reference Format:

Zixuan Chen, Panagiotis Manolios, and Mirek Riedewald. Finding Linear Explanations for a Given Ranking. PVLDB, 14(1): XXX-XXX, 2020.
doi:XX.XX/XXX.XX

1 INTRODUCTION

Rankings play an essential role, from personal life choices to business decisions: They are prevalent in sports, where journalists and fans attempt to rank anything and anyone from teams to coaches and individual players. They help shoppers decide which product to purchase and let travelers more quickly identify the right hotel or flight ticket. Top-ranked universities attract applications from the best students in a matching process driven by university rankings [4, 47] and a university’s ranking of applicants. And there exists a rich history of algorithms for problems like k -shortest paths [19, 33, 60] and of database research on top- k queries [30, 46] and ranked enumeration or *any- k* queries [5, 14, 51–53].

While that previous work focused on performance and complexity aspects for computing the ranked output of a non-trivial query, we instead are interested in questions related to the emerging topic of algorithmic fairness: Given a ranking *without* the function used to create it, **can we efficiently synthesize linear scoring functions that explain it well?** The following example illustrates this idea.

EXAMPLE 1 (NBA MVP SELECTION). *Every year, the NBA’s Most Valuable Player (MVP) is selected by a panel of sportswriters and broadcasters from the US and Canada. Each panelist chooses their top-5 players, assigning them 10, 7, 5, 3, and 1 points, respectively. The final ranking, and thus the MVP, is determined based on the point total. Even though the voting protocol is public, it does not reveal how individual player features impacted it, e.g., offensive vs*

defensive skills. Even the panelists themselves may not be able to definitively and quantitatively answer this question.

For each player, a wealth of data exists, including feature attributes such as points scored (P), rebounds (R), assists (A), steals (S), and blocks (B). Using these five attributes, our system RANKEXPLAIN can produce an explanation “when sorting NBA players by scoring function $0.02R + 0.14A + 0.84B$ ($0.1R + 0.36A + 0.54B$ for z -score normalized data), the panelists’ top-3 ranking among all players who got at least one vote can be recovered exactly.”

Such an explanation can be misleading, especially when there are similarly plausible alternatives. RANKEXPLAIN can easily explore such alternative explanations by taking into account additional constraints. For instance, to explore explanations that pay more attention to offensive skills, we can add absolute thresholds like the coefficient of P is at least 0.1 or relative constraints like the coefficient of B to not exceed the sum of the coefficients of P and A . Given the former constraint, RANKEXPLAIN discovers that scoring function $0.1P + 0.11R + 0.17A + 0.61B$ ($0.32P + 0.27R + 0.22A + 0.19B$ for z -score normalized data) would also recover the panel’s top-3 ranking. This means that there are two equally plausible MVP ranking explanations: one that suggests blocks mattered much more than other attributes, which is not widely agreed, and another where offensive skills (especially points scored) are appreciated more.

We focus on linear scoring functions, because they are unique in guaranteeing the *additivity* property. Additivity means that the effect of a causal variable (here, a data attribute) on the outcome (the score) does not depend on the value of another causal variable. For instance, for $0.1P + 0.11R + 0.17A + 0.61B$, adding 1 to A will always increase the score by 0.17, no matter the values of P, R, B . On the other hand, in a non-linear function with interaction terms like $0.1PA$, adding 1 to A increases the score by $0.1P$ and thus the change depends on P . (The same applies to non-linear functions represented in other formats, e.g., as a regression tree or a deep neural network.)

Furthermore, in contrast to linear functions, complex blackbox scoring functions learned by state-of-the-art machine-learning (ML) approaches generally do not guarantee *monotonicity*. Monotonicity means that if a tuple’s feature values improve, its score should never decrease. For instance, if an NBA player increases his steals per game, while keeping all other attribute values the same or better, his score should not decrease. A linear function with non-negative weights guarantees this property, but methods for training more complex models like regression trees, deep neural networks, or ensembles have no mechanisms to guarantee that the learned model will be monotonic.

In principle, classic linear regression could learn a linear scoring function. Unfortunately, there are 3 problems. First, the given ranking may not reveal ground-truth scores. This is easy to fix

Method	Additivity	Monotonicity	Constraints	SAT exactly	OPT exactly	Scalability
RANKEXPLAIN-OPT (Section 3.2)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	★
RANKEXPLAIN-SAT (Section 3.3)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	★★★★
RANKEXPLAIN-Cell (Section 5.2)	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	★★
Linear Regression (Section 5.4)	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	★★★★
Ordinal Regression [49]	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	★★

Table 1: Summary of RANKEXPLAIN and competitors for learning linear ranking functions.

by deriving artificial scores based on the tuple’s position in the ranking. Second, linear regression, like other ML methods, does not offer a mechanism for specifying *constraints* that force the learning method to explore the desired alternative scoring functions, like the absolute and relative thresholds for defensive-skill attributes in [Example 1](#).

Third, existing ML techniques, including linear regression, can only *approximately* solve the problems we refer to as SAT and OPT. Given a class of scoring functions, SAT asks if any function in the class can exactly reproduce the given ranking. OPT asks to identify the function in the class that minimizes ranking error, measured in terms of the tuple-wise rank differences between the given ranking and the ranking induced by the scoring function. (We define problems OPT and SAT formally for linear scoring functions in [Section 2](#).) Note that linear regression optimizes for a different success measure: squared error. This could in principle be addressed through boosting techniques like AdaRank [57]. Unfortunately, they still does not guarantee to find exact solutions for SAT and OPT. The only exception we are aware of is the ordinal regression technique of Srinivasan [49]. It can exactly solve the SAT problem, but due to the use of a different error measure, it still cannot solve OPT exactly.

Hence we propose to design a new solution based on formal methods, where the relevant constraints are a natural component of the program specification and where the exact solution is returned. Our RANKEXPLAIN technique can express both the rank-error measure and the constraints about the scoring function (like the requirement to include defensive-skill attributes in [Example 1](#)), allowing it to find the desired solutions as summarized in [Table 1](#). There RANKEXPLAIN-OPT and RANKEXPLAIN-SAT refer to versions that solve the problem exactly, while RANKEXPLAIN-Cell relies on a heuristic that trades result quality for faster execution time. In summary, we make the following major contributions:

- We formally define the top- k ranking explanation problem as the problem of recovering a given ranking over a set of multi-dimensional entities with a linear scoring function. Here we distinguish between SAT, the problem of determining if there exists a linear function giving rise to the exact ranking, and OPT, the problem of finding a linear scoring function that minimizes position-based ranking approximation error.
- We propose RANKEXPLAIN, which solves SAT and OPT exactly and also supports multi-dimensional slope constraints. Together, this functionality explains how the ranking could

be obtained and it enables the user to search for plausible alternative explanations. Our techniques can be implemented in standard MILP solvers like Gurobi.

- A generally overlooked challenge is posed by numerical imprecision, which can have significant impact in the context of ranking. We propose techniques that address this problem in a principled way, and which can also be applied in other contexts involving state-of-the-art MILP solvers, which have become popular for reverse data management.
- We propose techniques for improving performance and scalability.
- Using several real and synthetic data, we demonstrate that RANKEXPLAIN is practical and performant. We also show that all competitors, even after extending and adapting them to be applicable to our problems, are not viable alternatives.

2 PROBLEM DEFINITION

Our main goal is to find linear scoring functions that explain a given ranking over a relation R , in the sense that when ranking the R -tuples by score, the 2 rankings are identical or at least very similar. The given *ranking* is a permutation of R , such that each tuple is either strictly greater than the next, or they are equal. The *rank* of a tuple is defined by 1 plus the number of tuples that are strictly greater in the permutation. For instance, $\pi = [r_1 > r_2 = r_3 > r_4]$ is a ranking of $R = \{r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4\}$ where, due to the tie between r_2 and r_3 , the tuple ranks are 1, 2, 2, and 4, respectively. Notice that this ranking is equivalent to $[r_1 > r_3 = r_2 > r_4]$, i.e., tied tuples can be reordered arbitrarily.

DEFINITION 1 (GIVEN RANKING). *A given ranking π over dataset $R = \{r_1, \dots, r_n\}$ is a permutation of R such that adjacent tuples have relation $>$ or $=$, i.e., w.l.o.g.,*

$$\pi = [r_1 \triangleright_1 r_2 \triangleright_2 \dots \triangleright_{n-1} r_n], \quad r_i \in R, \triangleright_i \in \{>, =\}.$$

The rank of $r \in R$ is $\pi(r) = |\{r' \in R \mid r' > r\}| + 1$.

[Table 2](#) summarizes important notation. A *top- k ranking query* Q over relation R induces a *score-based ranking* of R ’s tuples; it is defined in SQL as

```
SELECT id, fW(A1, A2, ..., Am) AS Score
FROM R
WHERE -- some conditions
ORDER BY Score DESC
LIMIT k.
```

Conceptually, Q sorts all R -tuples by a function f_W , returning the k highest-scoring ones in descending order. As discussed in [Section 1](#),

Table 2: Notation

Symbol	Definition
Q	Top- k ranking query
R	Relation
$n = R $	Number of tuples in R
A_1, \dots, A_m	Attributes of R used for ranking
f_W	Linear scoring function over A_1, \dots, A_m
$W = (w_1, \dots, w_m)$	Weight vector defining f_W
\mathcal{P}	Predicate constraining the choices of W
$\pi = [r_1 \triangleright_1 r_2 \triangleright_2 \dots \triangleright_{n-1} r_n]$	Given ranking ($r_i \in R, \triangleright_i \in \{>, =\}$)
$\pi(r)$	Rank of $r \in R$ in π
ρ_W	Ranking of R induced by function f_W
$\rho_W(r)$	Rank of r based on scoring function f_W
$R_\pi(k)$	Top- k result for given ranking π
$R_W(k)$	Top- k result for scoring function f_W
id	Primary key of R
δ_{sr}	Relationship indicator between $s, r \in R$
u_r	Importance factor of r
τ	Gurobi precision tolerance (default: 10^{-6})
$\hat{\tau}$	A value minimally greater than τ
ϵ_1, ϵ_2	Thresholds for handling numerical imprecision
$D(r)$	Dominator set of r

we study linear scoring functions, which is a weighted sum over numerical attributes A_1, \dots, A_m of R , i.e.,

$$f_W(A_1, A_2, \dots, A_m) = \sum_{i=1}^m w_i A_i, \quad (1)$$

where $W = (w_1, \dots, w_m)$ and w.l.o.g., $w_i \geq 0, i = 1, \dots, m$ and $\sum_{i=1}^m w_i = 1$. We may omit W from the function name when it is clearly implied.

In the presence of score ties, all tied tuples have the same rank, determined by the number of tuples with higher scores. For instance, tuples r_1, \dots, r_4 with scores 9, 6, 6, and 5, respectively, have ranks 1, 2, 2, and 4, respectively. The result of a top- k ranking query are the first k tuples, with ties broken arbitrarily. Here, both $[r_1, r_2]$ and $[r_1, r_3]$ are valid answers for a top-2 query.

DEFINITION 2 (SCORE-BASED RANKING). *Given a scoring function f_W on R , the rank of a tuple $r \in R$ is*

$$\rho_W(r) = |\{r' \in R \mid f_W(r') > f_W(r)\}| + 1.$$

DEFINITION 3 (TOP- k RESULT). *Given a top- k query, its result $R_W(k)$ is any subset of R of cardinality k that satisfies*

$$\forall r \in R_W(k), r' \in R \setminus R_W(k) : f_W(r) \geq f_W(r').$$

In practice, linear scoring functions may not be able to exactly reproduce the given ranking. Hence we are interested in 2 questions: Is it at all possible for any linear scoring function to exactly reproduce the given ranking? If not, how close can we get, measuring approximation error as the sum of absolute position errors over all tuples? Note that users typically only care about the k top-ranked tuples, i.e., the order of lower-ranked competitors does not matter. (Our techniques generalize to other subsets as we outline in [Section 3.4](#).) Hence we focus on the following problems:

DEFINITION 4 (TOP- k RANKING EXPLANATION PROBLEMS). *Given a ranking π and a top- k ranking query Q on R :*




Figure 1: Regions for rankings without ties (spaces bounded by the two diagonal lines and the square) and with ties (two diagonal lines), and one point to achieve a certain ranking (star). SAT asks whether the region for a given ranking exists. OPT asks for the score-based ranking with the minimum error compared to a given ranking.

- *Satisfiability (SAT): Does there exist a weight vector W such that $\sum_{r \in R_\pi(k)} |\rho_W(r) - \pi(r)| = 0$, i.e., the ranking generated by W exactly matches the given ranking for all top- k tuples?*
- *Optimization (OPT): What is the minimum position error $\min_W \sum_{r \in R_\pi(k)} |\rho_W(r) - \pi(r)|$ for any linear scoring function?*

Figure 1 illustrates the above problems in the 2D space. The diagonal lines correspond to scoring functions where some tuples' scores are tied, separating regions without score ties.

3 SOLUTION USING LINEAR PROGRAMS

We formalize the problems introduced in [Section 2](#) as satisfiability modulo theories (SMT) or mixed-integer linear programming (MILP) problems with constraints in a way that enables efficient solutions, starting with the modeling of the error function.

3.1 Ranking Approximation Error

We need to express the difference $\sum_{r \in R_\pi(k)} |\rho_W(r) - \pi(r)|$ between the given ranking π and its approximation based on linear scoring function f_W . Similar to our previous work [\[9\]](#), we can leverage indicator variables, but now we must take into account the rank of every top- k tuple. For the appropriate pairs (s, r) of R -tuples, we define an indicator δ_{sr} whose value is 1 if s has a greater score than r , and 0 otherwise:

$$\delta_{sr} = \left(\sum_{i=1}^m w_i (s.A_i - r.A_i) > 0 \right), \quad r \in R_\pi(k), s \in R, s \neq r. \quad (2)$$

A tied score implies $\delta_{sr} = \delta_{rs} = 0$. From [Definition 2](#) follows that the rank of tuple r according to scoring function f_W is $\rho_W(r) = 1 + \sum_{s \in R; s \neq r} \delta_{sr}$, resulting in approximation error

$$\sum_{r \in R_\pi(k)} \left| \sum_{s \in R; s \neq r} \delta_{sr} + 1 - \pi(r) \right|. \quad (3)$$

EXAMPLE 2. *Consider $R(A_1, A_2, A_3)$ with tuples $r = (3, 2, 8)$, $s = (4, 1, 15)$, and $t = (1, 1, 14)$, and given ranking $\pi = [r > s > t]$.*

For r the indicators are:

$$\delta_{sr} = (w_1 - w_2 + 7w_3 > 0), \delta_{tr} = (-2w_1 - w_2 + 6w_3 > 0),$$

and since $\pi(r) = 1$, its contribution to the ranking error is

$$|\delta_{sr} + \delta_{tr} + 1 - \pi(r)| = |\delta_{sr} + \delta_{tr}|.$$

Intuitively, since r is at the top in the given ranking, any tuple beating it in the score-based ranking increases its position error by 1. For s we can analogously derive error term $|\delta_{rs} + \delta_{ts} - 1|$. Hence the overall position-based error for a linear scoring function that aims to correctly rank the top $k = 2$ tuples in the given ranking can be expressed as $|\delta_{sr} + \delta_{tr}| + |\delta_{rs} + \delta_{ts} - 1|$.

3.2 OPT Solution

Since the OPT version of the ranking-explanation problem minimizes approximation error, the solution formulation follows directly from Equations (2) and (3):

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \sum_{r \in R_\pi(k)} \left| \pi(r) - 1 - \sum_{s \in R; s \neq r} \delta_{sr} \right| \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \delta_{sr} = \left(\sum_{i=1}^m w_i (s.A_i - r.A_i) > 0 \right), \quad r \in R_\pi(k), s \in R, s \neq r \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Instead of the top- k tuples, any subset of tuples of R could be selected as the objective tuples that should be ranked correctly. And by setting $k = n$, the algorithm considers the entire ranking.

Program properties. Equation (4) is a linear program with $k \cdot n$ binary integer indicator variables and m continuous weight variables. Hence we can directly solve it using a MILP solver like Gurobi [24]. SMT theorem provers like Z3 [13] can be used if we convert the optimization problem to a series of satisfiability problems, performing binary search to find the smallest error value for which a satisfying assignment can be found.

EXAMPLE 3. In Example 2, the answer for OPT is 0, because linear scoring functions exist that perfectly rank r before s , and both before t . (This also implies that the answer for SAT is “SATISFIABLE”.) Figure 2 illustrates the solution space, with the weights w_1, w_2, w_3 assigned to the axes. The red 2D triangle in 3D space represents the set of all W where $w_1 + w_2 + w_3 = 1$. Note that the star and the other 2 lines fall into the triangle. Those lines show the boundaries for indicators δ_{tr} and δ_{sr} (and hence also δ_{rs}). Indicator δ_{ts} is not visible because it only intersects with the triangle at corner point $(0, 1, 0)$: s dominates t and hence δ_{ts} must be 0. The star represents a scoring function that perfectly recovers the given ranking $\pi = [r > s > t]$, falling into the intersection of half-spaces satisfying $\delta_{tr} = 0, \delta_{sr} = 0, \delta_{rs} = 1, \delta_{ts} = 0$. This intersection can intuitively be described as the set of weight vectors with small w_1 , large w_2 , and very small w_3 .

3.3 SAT Solution

We could solve SAT by slightly modifying the OPT solution, essentially converting the objective function into a constraint that forces the approximation error to be zero. Fortunately, by exploiting the




Figure 2: Example 3: Solution space (2D triangle in 3D space), ranking function recovering the given ranking $\pi = [r > s > t]$ (star), and indicator boundaries (colored lines). The numbers indicate the values of the indicators when selecting the weight from the corresponding side of the line (with the line belonging to the side of 0).

problem structure, a much more efficient solution is possible as captured by the following lemma.

LEMMA 1. For any given ranking $\pi = [r_1 \triangleright_1 r_2 \triangleright_2 \cdots \triangleright_{n-1} r_n]$ and any linear scoring function f_W , it holds:

$$\begin{aligned} \forall 1 \leq j < n : f_W(r_j) \triangleright_j f_W(r_{j+1}) \\ \Leftrightarrow \sum_{r \in R} \left| \pi(r) - 1 - \sum_{s \in R; s \neq r} \delta_{sr} \right| = 0. \end{aligned}$$

The proof leverages transitivity of the ordering relation. Intuitively, the lemma states that achieving zero approximation error is equivalent to enforcing the proper score relationship between adjacent tuples in the given ranking. For instance, for $\pi = [r_1 > r_2 = r_3 > r_4]$, the corresponding constraints are $r_1 > r_2$, $r_2 = r_3$, and $r_3 > r_4$. Hence our solution simply constructs a chain of $n - 1$ comparisons that enforce exactly the pairwise relationships in π . Notice that for a top- k ranking query, we only need the $k - 1$ relationships for the top- k tuples, while for the lower-ranked tuples it suffices to ensure that their scores do not exceed that of the k -th tuple:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^m w_i (r_j.A_i - r_{j+1}.A_i) \triangleright_j 0, \quad 1 \leq j < k, \\ \sum_{i=1}^m w_i (r_k.A_i - r_j.A_i) \geq 0, \quad k < j \leq n. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Program properties. No indicator variables are needed; instead there are $n - 1$ linear constraints of the type $\sum_{i=1}^m w_i (s.A_i - r.A_i) \triangleright 0$, where $\triangleright \in \{>, =, \geq\}$. All m weight variables are continuous, making the problem easier compared to programs with integer variables. Any SMT solver like Z3, and even any MILP solver like Gurobi

can be used. When the problem is satisfiable, these solvers return a *certificate*, which is an assignment of W .

EXAMPLE 4. To ensure that r and s are ranked at positions 1 and 2, respectively, the constraints are:

$$w_1 - w_2 + 7w_3 > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad 3w_1 + w_3 \geq 0,$$

which require r to beat s and s to not lose to t , respectively. Notice that a formulation based on Equation (4), where the objective function becomes a constraint forcing the error to be zero, would require 4 indicators and the use of variables for absolute values and errors.

3.4 Extensions

A great advantage of our formal-method-based solution is its flexibility. We discuss possible extensions for which the resulting solutions remain linear programs. A detailed empirical study of their properties is beyond the scope of this paper.

Data normalization. Users sometimes prefer normalized attribute values. For instance, in Example 1, the top values for number of points scored per game will often be 10 times the number of blocks and 15 times the number of steals. To map such diverse attributes to comparable ranges, the most common approaches are:

- Min-max normalization: replace A_i by $\frac{A_i - \min(A_i)}{\max(A_i) - \min(A_i)}$.
- Mean normalization: replace A_i by $\frac{A_i - \mu(A_i)}{\max(A_i) - \min(A_i)}$.
- Z-score normalization [1]: replace A_i by $\frac{A_i - \mu(A_i)}{\sigma(A_i)}$.

Here \min , \max , μ , σ refer to the minimum, maximum, average, and standard deviation of the A_i -values in R .

It is straightforward to support data normalization by first converting the data columns and then running RANKEXPAIN on the converted dataset. However, if the user wants to explore and compare the scoring-function coefficients for all 3 normalizations, they would have to run the solver 3 times on the differently normalized data. We can avoid this by *running the solver only on the original dataset R and then applying the desired transformation afterward to the weights W* . To see why this produces the equivalent outcome, notice that each transformation replaces an original A_i -value by $c_i A_i + c'_i$ for appropriate constants c_i, c'_i that are determined by the A_i -values of the R -tuples. Since

$$\sum_i \frac{w_i}{c_i} (c_i A_i + c'_i) = \sum_i w_i A_i + \sum_i \frac{c'_i w_i}{c_i}$$

and $\sum_i \frac{c'_i w_i}{c_i}$ is independent of a tuple's attribute values, the score difference and hence the order between any two R -tuples remains unchanged if we compute their scores using $\sum_i \frac{w_i}{c_i} (c_i A_i + c'_i)$ instead of $\sum_i w_i A_i$ (Equation (1)). Stated differently, after finding the optimal weights W on the original data R , we can easily obtain the scoring function that achieves the same ranking on the normalized data by replacing each w_i with w_i/c_i . For instance, for Z-score normalization we replace w_i with $w_i \sigma(A_i)$.

Tuple importance. The approximation error defined by Equation (3) treats all top- k tuples equally, which may not always be desirable. For instance, in Example 1, getting the top player wrong would affect the MVP-election outcome. This could be prevented

by adding *constraints*, e.g.,

$$\sum_{s \in R; s \neq r} \delta_{sr} \leq c$$

to enforce that r is ranked c or better, or

$$\left| \pi(r) - 1 - \sum_{s \in R; s \neq r} \delta_{sr} \right| \leq c$$

to enforce that r is at most c positions off in the approximate ranking. The outcome of adding such hard constraints is binary: either a solution is found (possibly with greater approximation error), or the problem becomes unsatisfiable. For a “soft” version of this idea, we can instead use importance factors that steer the solution in the right direction by increasing the error penalty for important tuples. For instance, by using a larger factor u_r for a tuple r ranked near the top, the method is forced to pay more attention to correctly ranking them when minimizing approximation error. Formally, we use objective

$$\min \sum_{r \in R_\pi(k)} u_r \left| \pi(r) - 1 - \sum_{s \in R; s \neq r} \delta_{sr} \right| \quad (6)$$

where u_r is the given importance factor of tuple r .

Other tuples of interest. In a top- k ranking query, the k top-ranked tuples play the most important role. However, our technique can in principle be extended to provide explanations for any other set of k tuples, e.g., k tuples “in the middle” or even tuples that are not in adjacent positions in the given ranking. The corresponding modifications of the OPT (Equation (4)) and SAT (Equation (5)) solutions remain linear programs.

Alternative optimization goals. Instead of the error for OPT defined as the sum of absolute position deviations, we could use other objectives such as:

Inversions: $|\{r \in R_\pi(k), s \in R, \pi(r) < \pi(s) \mid \rho_W(r) > \rho_W(s)\}|$,

Pairwise penalty [49]: $\sum_{r, s \in R, \pi(r) < \pi(s), \rho_W(r) > \rho_W(s)} f_W(s) - f_W(r)$,

Largest individual position error: $\max_{r \in R_\pi(k)} |\rho_W(r) - \pi(r)|$.

4 IMPLEMENTATION DETAILS

We discuss important implementation aspects for solving Equations (4) and (5), ranging from solver choice to dealing with numerical issues.

4.1 Solver Summary

We use Gurobi, a SOA commercial mathematical programming solver that can handle MILP (Mixed Integer Linear Programming) problems. It can solve satisfiability problems like SAT and, when provided with an objective function, it can also solve the corresponding optimization problem like OPT. Gurobi offers some of the most advanced algorithms of any similar tool, including standard techniques such as cutting planes and symmetry breaking, as well as various heuristics and the ability to run in parallel.

Gurobi offers a *timeout* parameter to let users control the solver's execution time. When the program times out, the best solution

found is returned. This feature provides the flexibility to control the trade-off between execution time and solution quality.

4.2 Handling Strict Inequalities

The programs for both OPT (Equation (4)) and SAT (Equation (5)) contain strict inequalities. Unfortunately, Gurobi and other solvers generally do not support strict inequalities for optimization problems. This is not an implementation issue, but an inherent limitation: Strict inequality constraints define open sets (instead of closed sets), therefore the optimal solution is not well-defined. Consider a problem like “max x , s.t. $x < 1$.” Assume there was a maximal answer $x = c$. Since we can construct a greater answer by “splitting the difference” to 1, i.e., setting $x = (c + 1)/2$, we obtain a contradicting to the assumption that c was maximal. With non-strict constraint $x \leq 1$, the optimal solution is well-defined as $x = 1$.

This means that every strict inequality must be converted to a non-strict one. The standard approach involves adding a tiny positive constant ε , i.e., $X - Y > 0$ would be converted to $X - Y \geq \varepsilon$. This dovetails nicely with the way we propose to handle numerical issues, as discussed next.

4.3 Handling Numerical Issues

Numerical issues caused by the limited precision of real-world data types are well-known, but rarely receive attention in database research. This is not surprising, because when one cares about a value in isolation, e.g., an aggregate over a relation or the probability returned by a prediction model, a small error does not change the nature of the output. However, **in the context of ranking, even a tiny imprecision can significantly alter the result.** Consider 2 tuples r_1 and r_2 whose scores 1.0 and 1.1 were computed on a system with numerical precision tolerance $\tau = 0.2$. Even though r_1 nominally looks like the winner, when taking the imprecision into account, the *true* score of r_2 may actually be greater. This could make the difference between a positive and a negative decision, e.g., getting admitted to a university or not, or in terms of the amount of attention received, e.g., when choosing a search result to click on. Hence we consider it essential for any system relying on score-based ranking, which is a very common approach [2, 3, 59, 61], to explicitly deal with the issue of numerical imprecision.

Notice that numerical imprecision appears in virtually all ranking-related contexts, from programming languages used to express scoring functions and prediction models (that may be used to generate data attributes) to solvers like Gurobi [23]. This can create surprising behavior for less experienced users. Consider unsatisfiable constraint $x \leq 0 \wedge x \geq 10^{-10}$. With numerical tolerance $\tau = 10^{-6}$, a solver like Gurobi may incorrectly determine the constraint to be satisfiable [25]. This happens, because the solver considers a constraint as satisfied when the value is “sufficiently close.” More formally, constraint $E \leq c$, for some constant c and numerical expression E involving floating-point numbers, would be considered satisfied for any E whose value does not exceed $c + \tau$ (and analogously for $E \geq c$). Thus, values such as $x = 0$ or $x = 10^{-8}$ would satisfy both $x \leq 0$ and $x \geq 10^{-10}$ when $\tau = 10^{-6}$.

One may be tempted to “fix” the problem by reducing the error tolerance, e.g., by controlling the corresponding parameter in Gurobi. Unfortunately, this will generally not suffice for our ranking

problem for several reasons. First, precision cannot be set to zero. E.g., Gurobi does not allow τ to be set lower than 10^{-9} , and hence we always face issues related to imprecision. Second, tuple scores could be arbitrarily close to each other, thus no tolerance value can ever guarantee to fully resolve the issue. Third, smaller tolerances tend to significantly slow down the solver. As a consequence, we propose to make our solution robust against imprecision by reflecting it explicitly in the constraints. The main idea is to ensure that (i) tuples with different ranks in given ranking π have a sufficiently large score gap and (ii) the scores of tied tuples in π are sufficiently close together.

Numerical robustness for OPT. We start by modifying Equation (4) for OPT. Recall that indicator δ_{sr} is defined to capture if s has a strictly higher score than r . Due to the numerical tolerance, $f_W(s) - f_W(r) > 0$ is considered satisfied by solvers like Gurobi as long as $f_W(s) - f_W(r) > -\tau$. Together with the analogous result for δ_{rs} , this implies that indicators δ_{sr} and δ_{rs} could have value 1 at the same time, resulting in the undesirable scenario where s beats r and at the same time r beats s , which is impossible in practice. To prevent this, we must enforce a larger gap between the scores when the indicator is set to 1. In general, we replace Equation (4) with

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \sum_{r \in R_\pi(k)} \left| \pi(r) - 1 - \sum_{s \in R, s \neq r} \delta_{sr} \right| \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \delta_{sr} = 1 \Rightarrow f_W(s) - f_W(r) \geq \varepsilon_1, \quad r \in R_\pi(k), s \in R, s \neq r \\ & \delta_{sr} = 0 \Rightarrow f_W(s) - f_W(r) \leq \varepsilon_2, \quad r \in R_\pi(k), s \in R, s \neq r \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

How should thresholds ε_1 and ε_2 be set? We must enforce the following properties for every pair of R -tuples r and s :

- P1 If the true score of s is not strictly greater than the true score of r , then $\delta_{sr} = 0$.
- P2 If s has greater score than r , then r cannot have greater score than s . Hence indicators δ_{sr} and δ_{rs} cannot both have value 1.
- P3 Tuple s cannot at the same time have greater and not greater score than r . Hence an indicator δ_{sr} can have value 0 or value 1, but not both.
- P4 If r and s have scores that are practically indistinguishable, i.e., they are at most τ apart, then their scores should be considered tied. (Due to the precision tolerance, the true scores could be in either order.)

The following lemmas form the foundation for setting ε_1 and ε_2 to achieve all these properties. The proofs involve standard manipulations of the inequalities guaranteed by Gurobi’s tolerance and hence are omitted.

LEMMA 2. *To guarantee that $\delta_{sr} = 1$ only if $f_W(s) - f_W(r) > 0$, it must hold that $\varepsilon_1 > \tau$.*

LEMMA 3. *In order to ensure that either $\delta_{sr} = 0$ or $\delta_{sr} = 1$, but not both are true at the same time, it must hold that $\varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2 > 2\tau$.*

LEMMA 4. *We obtain $\delta_{sr} = \delta_{rs} = 0$ only if $-(\varepsilon_2 + \tau) \leq f_W(s) - f_W(r) \leq \varepsilon_2 + \tau$.*

From [Lemma 4](#) follows that for supporting ties, we need $\varepsilon_2 + \tau \geq 0$, hence $\varepsilon_2 \geq -\tau$. In addition, for property P4, we need to set

$$\varepsilon_2 = 0.$$

With [Lemma 3](#), this implies $\varepsilon_1 > 2\tau$ in order to ensure P3. This automatically ensures P1 and P2 ([Lemma 2](#)). Since any $\varepsilon_1 > 2\tau$ ensures the properties, which value should one use? When setting $\varepsilon_2 = 0$, the indicator constraints in [Equation \(7\)](#) enforce:

- Tuple r beats tuple s ($\delta_{rs} = 1, \delta_{sr} = 0$) for true scores satisfying $f_W(s) - f_W(r) \leq -\varepsilon_1 + \tau$.
- Tuples r and s are tied ($\delta_{rs} = \delta_{sr} = 0$) for true scores satisfying $-\tau \leq f_W(s) - f_W(r) \leq \tau$.
- Tuple s beats tuple r ($\delta_{rs} = 0, \delta_{sr} = 1$) for true scores satisfying $f_W(s) - f_W(r) \geq \varepsilon_1 - \tau$.

Notice the “gap” between adjacent ranges. More formally, there is no valid setting for the indicators when the true score difference falls in ranges $-\varepsilon_1 + \tau < f_W(s) - f_W(r) < -\tau$ and $\tau < f_W(s) - f_W(r) < \varepsilon_1 - \tau$. This implies that if a solution for OPT or a satisfiable assignment for SAT are scoring functions whose difference for some tuple pair falls into the gap, then this solution cannot be found by the solver. And since the gap size equals $\varepsilon_1 - 2\tau$, the gap is minimized for smallest ε_1 , i.e.,

$$\varepsilon_1 = 2\hat{\tau},$$

where $\hat{\tau}$ is a value just minimally greater than τ . While this minimizes the probability of excluding the best solution for OPT or satisfiable weights for SAT, in practice it is somewhat risky to operate near the precision boundary of floating-point arithmetic. Hence we propose the following approach:

- (1) Start with a low setting like $\varepsilon_1 = 2\hat{\tau}$ or $\varepsilon_1 = 10\hat{\tau}$.
- (2) Verify the solution returned by the solver. (For OPT, check if the error for the score-based ranking agrees with the error computed by the solver based on the indicators. For SAT, verify that the score-based ranking matches the given ranking π .)
- (3) If the verification fails, increase ε_1 by factor 10 and repeat the process until the verification succeeds.

Intuitively, while a large ε_1 increases the gap where possible weight vectors are excluded, the larger gap better separates the ranges where r beats s , where they are tied, and where s beats r , increasing robustness against numerical imprecision. Our approach aims to identify the smallest gap where imprecision does not affect the result any more.

Numerical robustness for SAT. Using a similar analysis as for OPT, we propose the following imprecision-aware modifications of [Equation \(5\)](#). We leave all equality conditions $\sum_{i=1}^m w_i(r_j.A_i - r_{j+1}.A_i) = 0$ between top- k tuples unchanged. This automatically achieves property P4 for tuples that are tied in the given ranking π : With the numerical tolerance, the equality condition is satisfied iff the true difference $f_W(r_j) - f_W(r_{j+1})$ falls within range $[-\tau, \tau]$. Like for OPT, we replace each inequality $\sum_{i=1}^m w_i(r_j.A_i - r_{j+1}.A_i) > 0$ between top- k tuples with $\sum_{i=1}^m w_i(r_j.A_i - r_{j+1}.A_i) \geq \varepsilon_1$ to ensure properties P2 and P3 between top- k tuples. (Property P1 does not apply, because there are no indicators in the SAT program.)

The remaining inequalities are of type $\sum_{i=1}^m w_i(r_k.A_i - r_j.A_i) \geq 0$ between the k -th and all lower-ranked tuples $r_j, j > k$. Due to property P4, we need to ensure that no tuple outside the top- k

result has a score that exceeds the score of r_k by more than τ . Using an analysis similar to OPT, it is easy to show that this is achieved by leaving the inequality unchanged.

4.4 Weight Constraints

As discussed earlier, we require all weights to be non-negative, i.e., $w_i \geq 0, i = 1, \dots, m$. If there is an attribute A_i whose value needs to be subtracted from the score, instead of using a negative weight, we replace A_i with $-A_i$. Furthermore, it is easy to see that any solution W is equivalent to an infinite number of appropriately scaled solutions $c \cdot W$ for some positive constant $c > 0$. To avoid producing such redundant solutions, we follow common practice and require $\sum_{i=1}^m w_i = 1$.

Let \mathcal{P} denote the predicate that defines all weight constraints. In addition to the general constraints $w_i \geq 0, i = 1, \dots, m$ and $\sum_{i=1}^m w_i = 1$, \mathcal{P} can also be used to support constraints that force the solver to explore only certain weight vectors of interest:

- Recall [Example 1](#), where the initial explanation seemed to indicate a panel bias against defensive skills. Here we can specify *absolute* values like $c_l \leq w_i \leq c_u$, for some appropriately chosen $0 \leq c_l \leq c_u \leq 1$ to force the solver to explore the best linear scoring function for which w_i falls in the desired range, e.g., a lower weight on points scored and/or a higher weight on blocks.
- One could also specify *relative* constraints, such as $w_i + w_j \leq w_x + w_y + w_z$ to ensure certain related attribute categories do not (jointly) outweigh others.

Adding such a weight predicate \mathcal{P} does not change the nature of the problem, which is still solvable by a linear program.

5 SCALABILITY AND ERROR MANAGEMENT

Depending on the given ranking π and dataset R , in practice we may face 2 major challenges. First, even for the optimal linear scoring function, the ranking approximation error may exceed what the user is comfortable with. This happens when the linear scoring function lacks the flexibility to represent complex ordering relationships, typically between similar tuples. Second, even if the optimal scoring functions approximates the given ranking well, the solver may not be able to find it due to excessive memory or running time. Recall that the program for OPT contains kn binary indicators and m continuous variables. We now discuss techniques for addressing both issues.

5.1 Removing Indicators of Dominators and Dominatees

We reduce solver memory and running time by reducing the number of indicator variables for OPT ([Equation \(4\)](#)) by identifying pairs $s, r \in R$ where the indicator value does not depend on the weight W of the scoring function. When tuple s has greater or equal values for all ranking attributes A_1, \dots, A_m compared to r , with at least one being strictly greater, then s is a *dominator* for r and r is a *dominatee* for s . For such dominator-dominatee pair, $\delta_{sr} = 1$ and $\delta_{rs} = 0$, no matter the weights. Hence we remove the corresponding indicator constraints from [Equation \(4\)](#) and replace the indicator value in the objective function with the corresponding constant. For a tuple r with n_1 dominatees and n_2 dominators, only $(n - 1 - n_1 - n_2)$

indicator variables are needed, and Equation (4) becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \sum_{r \in R_\pi(k)} \left| \pi(r) - 1 - n_2 - \sum_{s \in R; s \neq r; r \notin D(s); s \notin D(r)} \delta_{sr} \right| \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \delta_{sr} = \left(\sum_{i=1}^m w_i (s.A_i - r.A_i) > 0 \right), \\ & r \in R_\pi(k), s \in R, s \neq r, r \notin D(s), s \notin D(r), \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where $D(r)$ is the set of dominators for r . The numerically robust version (Equation (7)) is modified analogously. Finding all dominator-dominatee pairs takes time $O(n^2)$, which is lower than the time complexity of solving the linear program. Hence we always apply this pre-processing step.

EXAMPLE 5. Applying the idea of removing dominators and dominatees to Example 2, we notice that s dominates t , implying $\delta_{ts} = 0$. Hence the ranking error term can be rewritten as:

$$|\delta_{sr} + \delta_{tr}| + |\delta_{rs} - 1|.$$

In addition to simplifying the objective function, 1 indicator variable is removed.

5.2 Explore Only the Most Promising Cell

Our next optimization targets the case when the OPT solution would have acceptable approximation error, but the solver fails to find it within a given time limit. The approach exploits the fact that an MILP solver’s running time tends to drop significantly, possibly by more than an order of magnitude, when it explores only a small fraction of the search space. This way we can design a method that lets RANKEXPLOIN control the tradeoff between running time and result quality.

RANKEXPLOIN takes a 2-step approach: (1) Identify the most promising small neighborhood where the OPT solution could lie, then (2) solve OPT only within that neighborhood. Given weight vector W , we define its neighborhood as the “cell” defined by hypercube $w_i - c \leq w_i \leq w_i + c$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, $0 < c < 1$. (We usually set c to a small value like 0.01 or 0.001.) Hence solving OPT within that cell means solving it after adding the hypercube constraints to Equations (4) and (7).

How can we identify a promising neighborhood in the weight space? RANKEXPLOIN relies on several heuristics. The main idea behind all of them is to start with a weight vector that already produces a “good” approximation, trying to find an even better one in its neighborhood cell.

Solution 1: Sampling. The most straightforward way of identifying promising cells is to randomly sample a large number of weight vectors and then pick the one with the lowest approximation error. Unfortunately, with increasing dimensionality, the sample space grows exponentially and hence sampling may be less likely to land in a good cell by chance. We also study this in Section 6.4.

Solution 2: Sliding windows. Similar to the local explanations approach (Section 5.3), when it is not feasible to run the solver for the given k on the entire input R , we can run it on a window of $n' \leq \min(k, n)$ of adjacent (in given ranking π) tuples, sliding this window from top to bottom of π . By solving OPT for each window, RANKEXPLOIN finds a local explanation for the ordering of

the tuples in the window. This heuristic is based on the intuition that the local scoring functions may be close to the best global scoring function.

Solution 3: Linear regression. As discussed in Section 5.4, we can adapt linear regression to fit a linear function to the score-augmented relation R . Even though it optimizes for the wrong goal, its weight W may identify a good neighborhood to explore using our OPT solution.

Solution 4: Ordinal regression. Ordinal regression (see Section 7) also produces a weight vector W . By using an “easier” objective, it can be solved much faster than OPT. Unfortunately, this objective is only loosely related to the position error. However, it could create a good starting point for exploring the neighborhood cell using OPT.

5.3 Local Explanations

When all else fails, we can reduce memory use, solver running time, and approximation error of OPT as much as desired by reducing the values of k and n . Both result in more “local” explanations, e.g., of the ordering of the top-50 instead of the top-100; and when compared to the next 1,000 instead of the next 20,000 lower-ranked tuples. This is meaningful, similar to approximating a more complex function with multiple piece-wise-linear models. In general, when the initial choice of k, n causes an exception (memory error, solver timeout, or undesirably high approximation error of the OPT solution), RANKEXPLOIN will explore a geometric sequence of k -values, e.g., $0.8^x k, x = 1, 2, \dots$, each time performing a binary search on n to find the largest number of lower-ranked tuples for which no exception occurs.

5.4 Linear Regression (LR)

Linear regression may appear like the obvious choice for our problem, because it is designed to learn a linear function that approximates an unknown function. However, it generally cannot solve SAT and OPT; and it requires several extensions for use as an approximate solution for OPT.

First, LR requires a dataset with features and score labels. While the ranking attributes A_1, \dots, A_m represent the features, there are no given labels. We propose to use the negative rank $-\pi(r)$ as the score label for each tuple $r \in R$, referring to the resulting labeled relation as the *label-augmented* version of R . Note that by perfectly predicting each score label, the weights found by LR would perfectly reproduce π . Second, even with the label-augmented relation, LR still optimizes for the wrong goal: minimizing score error for each tuple. While generally correlated with a better ranking, lower score errors do not guarantee lower position-based error. Hence LR generally cannot solve SAT. By coincidence, the minimum-score-error solution might happen to be a satisfying answer for SAT, but if the LR weight vector does not produce a perfect ranking, then one can neither infer satisfiability nor unsatisfiability of SAT. Third, since LR optimizes for the wrong error objective, its solution also does not provide any approximation guarantees for OPT. Fourth, LR cannot directly support the top- k ranking problem, because it does not distinguish between top- k and other tuples in R . The only meaningful approach here is to set $k = n$, i.e., consider the exact ranking of all n tuples. (Recall that the top- k ranking problem

aims to reproduce the exact ranking of the top- k tuples, but for all lower-ranked tuples only aims to ensure that they do not beat any top- k tuples.)

To address the mismatch between LR’s optimization goal and OPT, we can leverage boosting techniques that essentially rely on an outer loop that forces LR toward optimizing for an alternative objective, such as position-based error. Unfortunately the state-of-the-art AdaRank [57] did not produce satisfactory results in our experiments, often resulting in increased position-based error compared to the simple LR solution.

6 EXPERIMENTS

We demonstrate that our techniques are practical and compare them against related work in terms of both effectiveness and efficiency. For our approximation techniques, we quantify the tradeoff between running time and result quality.

6.1 Experimental Setup

Environment and Implementation. All experiments are executed on an Ubuntu Linux server with an Intel Xeon E5-2643 CPU and 128GB RAM. We implemented our solvers and optimizers in Java with the help of the Java libraries of the leading commercial optimizer Gurobi [24] and tested them on Java 11, 18 and Gurobi 9.5.2. For Gurobi we used their default configurations for multi-threaded execution, which means that on our machine it utilized 8 cores with up to 16 threads. To handle numerical issues, we set $\epsilon_1 = 10^{-4}$ and $\epsilon_2 = 0$ for the experiments, and verified that our solution avoided numerical issues successfully. Linear regression and AdaRank are implemented in Python and tested on Python 3.8.10, 3.10.4.

Competitors. We implemented the ordinal regression approach, which optimizes for a minimum score penalty [49], in Java and Gurobi and refer to it as *Ordinal Regression*. We also adopt the AdaRank algorithm of Xu and Li [57], which is a boosting technique originally designed for ranking documents in response to search queries. The algorithm trains multiple weak rankers—single features are used as weak rankers in their paper—on the training data (queries) and updates the weight distribution according to the performance on each query. We apply the AdaRank algorithm to our problem by replacing queries with tuples and the measure of performance on one query with the ranking error of a tuple. We refer to this implementation as *AdaRank*. Besides these existing competitors, we also test the performance of *Linear Regression* and random *Sampling*.

Datasets. Like previous work on related problems, e.g., [9, 27, 55], we use the latest version of the NBA data [38], a real dataset containing 22840 tuples with statistics of all NBA players from seasons 1979/80 to 2022/23. Each tuple represents a *player-season combination*—uniquely identified by the PLR attribute, which consists of player name, age and team. The default ranking attributes are the player’s average statistics during that season: PTS, REB, AST, STL, BLK, FG%, 3P%, and FT%. We ensure that every tuple has different statistics by only keeping one of the tuples with duplicate statistics. By default, NBA players are ranked using PER (Player

Efficiency Rating), whose computation involves a complicated formula and a few additional attributes that are not included in the basic ranking attributes [39].

To test scalability, we also generate synthetic data with 1 million tuples by default. For each tuple, the values of each ranking attribute are generated uniformly at random, and independent of the other attributes.

Parameters. Table 3 shows the parameter values studied, with the default setting in bold. We generally use more challenging settings for the problems that are more efficiently solvable. Cell size only applies to the cell-based approximation (Section 5.2).

6.2 Case Study: NBA MVP

We study the ranking for the 2022-23 NBA MVP award, i.e., here the given ranking is not based on PER, but the panel’s selections (see Example 1). There are 13 players who received at least 1 vote, with the last two being tied, and 8 ranking attributes as introduced in Section 6.1. Our approach returns UNSATISFIABLE in 20ms. In 696ms, the optimal result in terms of position error is returned. The corresponding linear-score-based ranking is [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 7, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 12], with the numbers indicating the player’s position in the given ranking. It has a total position error of 6, approximating the given ranking well and even reproducing the tie between the last two tuples. The weight vector after Z-score normalization is (0.26, 0.30, 0, 0, 0.05, 0.19, 0.05, 0.15), showing higher weights on PTS, REB and FG%. This aligns with the fact that the top-3 are all front-court players, who are good at scoring (PTS, FG%) and rebounding (REB).

To explore alternative explanations, we constrain the weight on PTS to be at most 0.1. Within 628ms RANKEXPAIN produces the corresponding optimal solution that has the same total position error of 6, but a completely different weight vector (0, 0, 0, 0.09, 0.70, 0.07, 0.03, 0.11). It heavily relies on blocks (BLK), with a weight of 0.7 vs 0.05 before, while completely ignoring PTS and REB, which had weights 0.26 and 0.3 before.

This demonstrates the unique power of RANKEXPAIN: there are 2 (and possibly many more) equally good (in terms of total position error), but very different, explanations for the player stats the MVP-panel members potentially focused on when determining their individual player rankings. A domain expert can use these insights to identify possible meta patterns. For instance, BLK is another statistic, front-court players tend to perform better on than guards. Hence the panel may have an implicit bias when it comes to these player positions, or during the 2022/23 season, the top centers and forwards simply played their position better than the top guards.

6.3 Performance on SAT

Neither *Sampling* nor *Linear Regression* can solve SAT exactly, because they are unable to prove an “UNSATISFIABLE” outcome. (At best, they may be lucky in finding a satisfying weight vector when SAT is “SATISFIABLE”.) When sampling returns only non-satisfying weight vectors, one can only derive a probability of the true answer being “UNSATISFIABLE”. When a satisfying weight vector is found, the true answer must be “SATISFIABLE”, but, depending on the fraction of satisfying assignments among all possible weight

Table 3: Experimental parameter settings on NBA data

Parameter	SAT (Section 6.3)	OPT (Section 6.4)	Approximation (Section 6.5)
Length of the given top ranking (k)	10, 20, 30, 40, 50 , 60, 70, 80, 90, 100	2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 10	5, 10 , 15, 20, 25
Number of tuples (n)	5000, 10000, 15000, 20000, 22840	5000, 10000, 15000, 20000, 22840	22840
Number of attributes (m)	4, 5, 6, 7, 8	3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8	8

vectors, this may require a huge number of samples to obtain a satisfying one. For linear regression, the problem lies in the mismatch between its optimization goal and position-based ranking error. This means that in general, the solution found by *Linear Regression* will not provide sufficient information to answer SAT. In particular, even when SAT is “SATISFIABLE”, linear regression may return a non-satisfying weight vector.

In practice, the answer to SAT is often negative, because a linear scoring function may not be flexible enough to exactly reproduce a ranking, especially for large values of k . For example, for the real NBA data and given ranking based on PER, the SAT problem is only “SATISFIABLE” for $k \leq 5$, i.e., a linear scoring function cannot fully reproduce the PER-based ranking of more than the top-5 players. Since neither *Sampling* nor *Linear Regression* can exactly answer SAT for unsatisfiable cases, we mainly discuss the performance of our proposed SAT solution Equation (5) here.

On the NBA data, we vary the length of the given top ranking (k), the number of tuples in the entire relation (n), and the number of ranking attributes (m). We compare the performance of our approach against the only applicable competitor *Ordinal Regression* on both “SATISFIABLE” and “UNSATISFIABLE” inputs. Since the full NBA data ranked by PER results in “UNSATISFIABLE” inputs for $k > 5$, we also include experiments where the players in the given ranking are ranked not by PER, but by the sum of their ranking-attribute values, i.e., the existence of a satisfying linear scoring function is ensured.

Varying k (Figure 3a). As k increases, there is no clear trend for the execution time, the execution time for *Ordinal Regression* shows an increasing trend while our approach remains fast. Interestingly, for larger k , the smaller solution space forces the returned certificate weight to be more similar to all-equal weight, which is the original function.

Varying n (Figure 3b). As n increases, execution time for both our RANKEXPLAIN and *Ordinal Regression* goes up but it is clear that the execution time increases much faster for *Ordinal Regression*.

Varying m (Figure 3c). As the number of ranking attributes increases, execution time goes up, but less steep than for n .

6.4 Performance on OPT

As discussed in Section 6.1, we compare the performance of our OPT approach Equation (4) in terms of position error against competitors *Sampling*, *Linear Regression*, *Ordinal Regression* and *AdaRank*. Even though *AdaRank* is an ensemble method that boosts linear regression so that it optimizes for position error, in all our experiments it actually resulted in greater error than *Linear Regression*. The reason is that one of the NBA ranking attributes is much more correlated with the given ranking than the others, resulting in that

same attribute being selected repeatedly as the weak ranker in each boosting round. Hence we omit the *AdaRank* results from the plots.

To make *Sampling* comparable to the other methods, we set a time budget equal to the time taken by RANKEXPLAIN. Similar to the SAT experiments, we vary k , n and m , but adjust their values to accommodate the higher running time needed for solving the more general OPT problem.

Varying k (Figure 3d). For a larger k , the error of all approaches increases. This is expected, as there are more tuples who contribute to the error. RANKEXPLAIN finds the optimal solution (OPT), with both *Sampling* and *Ordinal Regression* getting close. This, and the relatively large error, are caused by using only 3 ranking attributes (PTS, REB, AST). These 3 attributes do not adequately explain the top- k positions among the 22840 input tuples. We show below that using more ranking attributes will significantly reduce the error.

Varying n (Figure 3e). As the number of tuples increases, the error remains stable, because adding more lower-ranked tuples does not influence the top- k tuples too much: While the top- k tuples should be in the correct position, for the lower-ranked ones it suffices to rank them anywhere below the top- k . *Linear Regression* cannot exploit the weaker ordering requirements for lower-ranked tuples, resulting in relatively greater impact of those tuples on the solution, and thus steeper increase in error.

Varying m (Figure 3f). More attributes provide more choices to construct a more accurate scoring function, therefore error should generally decrease with m . RANKEXPLAIN as the only method producing the correct optimal answer even *guarantees* that adding ranking attributes will never increase error. The other methods do not provide this guarantee, which is also visible in the plot. Our approach even finds the perfect top-3 ranking for $m \geq 5$. Interestingly, *Sampling*’s error shows no clear trend, because more attributes lead to a higher-dimensional weight space to sample from. Depending on the attribute added, it may be more or less likely that a randomly sampled point will correspond to a low-error weight combination.

6.5 Scalability and Approximation

We study running time and error when solving OPT *approximately* using our cell-based approach Section 5.2. It allows RANKEXPLAIN to scale to larger values of k and n . Here we show results when using *Ordinal Regression* to identify promising cells. We vary k on the entire NBA dataset (see Table 3).

Approximation (Figure 3g). With the time cost of the same magnitude, the RANKEXPLAIN-Cell approach finds a better ranking in the cell around the solution found by *Ordinal Regression*. How much it improves over *Ordinal Regression* can be better seen in Figure 3h. Both *Sampling* and *Linear Regression* error are not competitive for larger k .




Figure 3: Performance on SAT, OPT and approximation

Tradeoff of cell size (Figure 3h). We explore the tradeoff between approximation quality and size of the cell (represented by the sidelength), using the same parameter settings as for $k = 10$ in Figure 3g. The curves show the error and execution time, respectively, for varying cell size. As cell size increases, the error drops significantly, with fairly little impact on the execution time until cell size reaches 0.012 (6 units). Beyond that, returns diminish rapidly.

Scalability on uniform data (Figure 3i). To test the scalability of our RANKEXPLAIN-SAT and RANKEXPLAIN-Cell techniques, we generate a larger synthetic dataset with 8 ranking attributes. To create an unsatisfiable SAT problem, we construct the given ranking as follows: Sort all tuples by the sum of all ranking attributes, then pick those at positions 6 to 10 and move them to positions 1 to 5. We verify that this given ranking cannot be reproduced by a linear scoring function for $k = 5$, even for the smallest n we explore. For

RANKEXPLAIN-Cell, we set cell size to 0.002. From the figure, it is clear that the execution time of RANKEXPLAIN-SAT RANKEXPLAIN-Cell increases with the number of tuples. However, even for 1 million tuples, the methods need only 8 seconds and 2 minutes, respectively. Here RANKEXPLAIN-Cell reduces the error compared to *Ordinal Regression* by 17%.

6.6 Impact of Other Design Choices

Why not use the OPT solution for SAT? We demonstrate the importance of using our specialized SAT program Equation (5) instead of the direct reduction from the OPT solution Equation (4), which adds a constraint to force the error equal to 0. In Figure 4a, we show representative results for uniform data when using Gurobi, setting $n = 100$, $m = 8$, and varying n from 5 to 25. Even for these

tiny datasets, execution time of RANKEXPLAIN-OPT with the 0-error constraint increases rapidly due to the quadratic number of indicators.

Impact of numerical issues. We study the impact of numerical issues, which are often overlooked. Recall that RANKEXPLAIN addresses numerical problems through thresholds $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2$ (Figure 4b). We use a small subset of the NBA data, consisting of 10 tuples and 8 attributes and vary k from 1 to 10. According to our analysis, we set $\varepsilon_1 = 10^{-4}, \varepsilon_2 = 0$. This is compared to a setting that essentially ignores numerical issues, where $\varepsilon_1 = 10^{-10}, \varepsilon_2 = 0$. With the larger ε_1 , RANKEXPLAIN-OPT always returns the perfect ranking, while the small ε_1 results in ranking errors. Essentially the solver believes to have found the optimal solution, but due to numerical problems, the actual ranking is not consistent with the solver’s view of it.

Why explore a cell around a promising weight vector?

Section 5.2 introduces the idea of finding a promising weight vector, followed by exploring the cell around it for better weight vectors. To study the effectiveness of this idea, we use the uniform dataset and set $n = 10,000, m = 3, k = 3$ and take 10,000 weight-vector samples. Figure 4c shows the average error for each cell. Note that since $m = 3$ and $w_1 + w_2 + w_3 = 1$, we only need to show w_1, w_2 in the 2D heatmap. The heatmap clearly shows the different distributions on different cells. In some cells, it is possible to get a good ranking, and all rankings are of high quality; while in other cells, most rankings are of low quality. Therefore, locating a good ranking function in the solution space may indicate locating a good cell.

7 RELATED WORK

Why-not-yet? Our previous work [9] introduces the why-not-yet problem, which returns a linear function that ranks a given tuple of interest into the top- k . One could attempt to solve SAT by solving the why-not-yet problem for all the top- k tuples, but that would be inefficient since SAT can be solved without the need for (integer) indicator variables, which why-not-yet relies on. The optimization version of why-not-yet finds the largest hyper-rectangle in the satisfiable solution space, while OPT explores scenarios considered unsatisfiable by why-not-yet. Hence RANKEXPLAIN complements why-not-yet by focusing on optimal ranking approximation with the minimum error compared to the given ranking. Moreover, the ranking explanation problem provides the flexibility to locate one tuple at a specific place by using Equation (3), while the why-not-yet problem is only able to rank a certain tuple into the top- k .

Ranking explanation. He, Lo et al. introduce why-not problems for top- k queries [27, 28, 58], which also return a refined query that includes the missing tuples, but allows the use of a larger k in addition to the refined ranking function. Vlachou et al. [55, 56] introduce the problem of reverse top- k queries of 2 types. The monochromatic type looks for *all* W where a query tuple ranks among the top- k . The authors only provide an exact solution for $m = 2$ and acknowledge the hardness of finding an exact solution in higher dimensions [56]. In the bichromatic type the weight vectors must be chosen from a given set of candidates, which differs from our setup. Similar to the monochromatic reverse top- k problem, [2, 3] also introduce an approach to identify *all* satisfiable regions by cutting the space with hyperplanes. However, because of the high time complexity of their algorithms, they resort to sampling-based

approaches for approximation. There is recent work using other measures (e.g., Shapley values [48]) to explain rankings [20, 45]. In the area of Machine Learning and Information Retrieval, there is also work on ranking explanation for recommendations, IR models or ranking models [12, 34, 40, 54], which is not directly related to our work.

Ordinal regression and Learning-to-rank. Srinivasan [49] discusses the ordinal regression problem. Its general goal also is to find a linear ranking function to approximate a given ranking. However, it uses a different objective than OPT: Instead of minimizing rank position error, the goal is to minimize a score penalty, computed as $f_W(r) - f_W(s)$, summed over all pairs $r, s \in R$ that are incorrectly ranked compared to given ranking π . For instance, assume $\pi = (A, B, C)$ and the scores for A, B, C are 1, 3, 2, respectively. Since both (A, B) and (A, C) are inverted by the score-based ranking, the penalty sums to $(3 - 1) + (2 - 1) = 3$. The advantage of ordinal regression is that it defines a significantly easier problem than OPT, because it neither requires indicator variables (and hence has no integer variables) nor the absolute-value function. Unfortunately, and in contrast to our optimization goal, minimizing the score penalty provides only weak guarantees about the number of positions a tuple may have moved up or down incorrectly. For example, if the score difference between the tuples at position 1 and 100 in π is less than 0.0001, then even moving all the top-10 tuples down 90 positions would result in a small total penalty below 0.1. The same penalty is incurred when just swapping two adjacent tuples whose scores differ by 0.1. In our approach, the corresponding position-based errors are 1800 and 2, respectively, telling a clear story about the impact on the tuple ordering.

A less strict version of the ordinal regression problem is to rank tuples to different ordinal scales (also called the ordinal classification problems) [26]. Its objective is to correctly classify data instead of sorting the tuples. This definition of the ordinal regression problem can also be considered a pointwise learning-to-rank problem [37]. Our problem is more related to the listwise learning-to-rank problems [6]. However, their goal is to construct a ranking model on training data, while our problem focuses on the given dataset with a given ranking and uses linear ranking functions to avoid complicated models.

Exact MILP solvers. The numerical issues described in Section 4 are known to be limitations in a number of applications using MILPs. To support such applications, there is recent work on numerically exact MILP solvers [11, 17]. Exact solvers operate over rational numbers and provide strong guarantees in the form of independently verifiable certificates of optimality. An example of an exact solver is SCIP [18]. While this line of work is promising and can provide a level of rigor for MILPs that is similar to that provided by SMT solvers, the current state-of-the-art tools are not yet capable of providing performance results that are competitive with MILPs that exclusively use floating point computation.

Query explanation. Our work fits into the general context of database usability [32] and reverse data management [42]. Chapman and Jagadish [7] introduce “why-not” to identify the relational operator that is responsible for an expected tuple to be missing from the query output. Later work continues to study why-not and why by refining queries [50], proposing data modifications [29] (related to how-to queries [43]), analyzing the complexity [41]




Figure 4: Experimental results for Section 6.6

and applying to different types of queries [8, 10, 21, 31, 58]. Recent work in the area is diverse including explaining missing answers over nested data [15, 16], and using diagrams, examples, query graphs, conditional instances, respectively, to help users understand queries [22, 35, 36, 44].

8 CONCLUSION

We formally define two top- k ranking explanation problems, SAT and OPT, and propose the first exact solution for the latter. Our SAT solution avoids integer variables, usually needed in the context of rankings in the form of indicators, and hence scales to large data. Our OPT solution finds the optimal answers with small errors, especially for data with more attributes. To make OPT scalable, we propose the notion of a neighborhood cell and solve OPT only for the most promising small cells. Tuning the cell size allows the user to explore the tradeoff between execution time and approximation quality. To overcome the numerical issues, we provide a careful problem analysis and propose numerically robust solutions. In future work, we intend to explore more general scoring functions, which may reduce the approximation error. We are also interested in the design of novel boosting techniques that may help linear regression identify solutions with lower position-based ranking error.

REFERENCES

- [1] Hervé Abdi. 2007. Z-scores. *Encyclopedia of measurement and statistics* 3 (2007), 1055–1058.
- [2] Abolfazl Asudeh, H. V. Jagadish, Gerome Miklau, and Julia Stoyanovich. 2018. On Obtaining Stable Rankings. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 12, 3 (2018), 237–250. <https://doi.org/10.14778/3291264.3291269>
- [3] Abolfazl Asudeh, H. V. Jagadish, Julia Stoyanovich, and Gautam Das. 2019. Designing Fair Ranking Schemes. In *Proceedings of the 2019 International Conference on Management of Data, SIGMOD 2019*. 1259–1276. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3299869.3300079>
- [4] Emery Berger. 2024. CSRankings: Computer Science Rankings. <https://csrankings.org/>.
- [5] Pierre Bourhis, Alejandro Grez, Louis Jachiet, and Cristian Riveros. 2021. Ranked Enumeration of MSO Logic on Words. In *24th International Conference on Database Theory, ICDT 2021 (LIPICs)*, Vol. 186. 20:1–20:19. <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.ICDT.2021.20>
- [6] Zhe Cao, Tao Qin, Tie-Yan Liu, Ming-Feng Tsai, and Hang Li. 2007. Learning to rank: from pairwise approach to listwise approach. In *Proceedings of the 24th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2007*. 129–136. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1273496.1273513>
- [7] Adriane Chapman and H. V. Jagadish. 2009. Why not?. In *Proceedings of the 2009 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data, SIGMOD 2009*. 523–534. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1559845.1559901>
- [8] Lei Chen, Xin Lin, Haibo Hu, Christian S. Jensen, and Jianliang Xu. 2015. Answering why-not questions on spatial keyword top- k queries. In *2015 IEEE 31st International Conference on Data Engineering, ICDE 2015*. 279–290. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICDE.2015.7113291>
- [9] Zixuan Chen, Panagiotis Manolios, and Mirek Riedewald. 2023. Why Not Yet: Fixing a Top- k Ranking that Is Not Fair to Individuals. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 16, 9 (2023), 2377–2390. <https://doi.org/10.14778/3598581.3598606>
- [10] Sean Chester and Ira Assent. 2015. Explanations for Skyline Query Results. In *Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Extending Database Technology, EDBT 2015*. 349–360. <https://doi.org/10.5441/002/EDBT.2015.31>
- [11] William Cook, Thorsten Koch, Daniel E Steffy, and Kati Wolter. 2013. A hybrid branch-and-bound approach for exact rational mixed-integer programming. *Mathematical Programming Computation* 5, 3 (2013), 305–344. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S12532-013-0055-6>
- [12] Khalil Damak, Sami Khenissi, and Olfa Nasraoui. 2021. Debaised Explainable Pairwise Ranking from Implicit Feedback. In *Fifteenth ACM Conference on Recommender Systems, RecSys 2021*. 321–331. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3460231.3474274>
- [13] Leonardo de Moura and Nikolaj Björner. 2008. Z3: an efficient SMT solver. In *Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems, 14th International Conference, TACAS 2008*. 337–340. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-78800-3_24
- [14] Shaleen Deep and Paraschos Koutris. 2021. Ranked Enumeration of Conjunctive Query Results. In *24th International Conference on Database Theory, ICDT 2021 (LIPICs)*, Vol. 186. 5:1–5:19. <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.ICDT.2021.5>
- [15] Ralf Diestelkämper, Seokki Lee, Boris Glavic, and Melanie Herschel. 2021. Debugging Missing Answers for Spark Queries over Nested Data with Breadcrumb. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 14, 12 (2021), 2731–2734. <https://doi.org/10.14778/3476311.3476331>
- [16] Ralf Diestelkämper, Seokki Lee, Melanie Herschel, and Boris Glavic. 2021. To Not Miss the Forest for the Trees - A Holistic Approach for Explaining Missing Answers over Nested Data. In *Proceedings of the 2021 International Conference on Management of Data, SIGMOD 2021*. 405–417. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3448016.3457249>
- [17] Leon Eifler and Ambros Gleixner. 2023. A computational status update for exact rational mixed integer programming. *Mathematical Programming* 197, 2 (2023), 793–812. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S10107-021-01749-5>
- [18] L. Eifler and A. Gleixner. 2024. Exact SCIP - a development version. (2024). <https://github.com/leonEIFLER/exact-SCIP>
- [19] David Eppstein. 1998. Finding the k Shortest Paths. *SIAM J. Comput.* 28, 2 (1998), 652–673. <https://doi.org/10.1137/S0097539795290477>
- [20] Abraham Gale and Amélie Marian. 2020. Explaining Monotonic Ranking Functions. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 14, 4 (2020), 640–652. <https://doi.org/10.14778/3436905.3436922>
- [21] Yunjun Gao, Qing Liu, Gang Chen, Baihua Zheng, and Linlin Zhou. 2015. Answering Why-not Questions on Reverse Top- k Queries. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 8, 7 (2015), 738–749. <https://doi.org/10.14778/2752939.2752943>
- [22] Amir Gilad, Zhengjie Miao, Sudeepa Roy, and Jun Yang. 2022. Understanding Queries by Conditional Instances. In *Proceedings of the 2022 International Conference on Management of Data, SIGMOD 2022*. 355–368. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3514221.3517898>

- [23] Gurobi Optimization, LLC. 2024. Guidelines for Numerical Issues. https://www.gurobi.com/documentation/current/refman/guidelines_for_numerical_i.html
- [24] Gurobi Optimization, LLC. 2024. Gurobi Optimizer Reference Manual. <https://www.gurobi.com>
- [25] Gurobi Optimization, LLC. 2024. Tolerances and user-scaling. https://www.gurobi.com/documentation/current/refman/tolerances_and_user_scalin.html
- [26] Pedro Antonio Gutiérrez, María Pérez-Ortiz, Javier Sánchez-Monedero, Francisco Fernández-Navarro, and César Hervás-Martínez. 2016. Ordinal Regression Methods: Survey and Experimental Study. *IEEE Trans. Knowl. Data Eng.* 28, 1 (2016), 127–146. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TKDE.2015.2457911>
- [27] Zhian He and Eric Lo. 2012. Answering Why-not Questions on Top-k Queries. In *2012 IEEE 28th International Conference on Data Engineering, ICDE 2012*. 750–761. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICDE.2012.8>
- [28] Zhian He and Eric Lo. 2014. Answering Why-Not Questions on Top-K Queries. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* 26, 6 (2014), 1300–1315. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TKDE.2012.158>
- [29] Melanie Herschel and Mauricio A. Hernández. 2010. Explaining Missing Answers to SFJUA Queries. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 3, 1 (2010), 185–196. <https://doi.org/10.14778/1920841.1920869>
- [30] Ihab F. Ilyas, George Beskales, and Mohamed A. Soliman. 2008. A survey of top-k query processing techniques in relational database systems. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 40, 4 (2008), 11:1–11:58. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1391729.1391730>
- [31] Md. Saiful Islam, Rui Zhou, and Chengfei Liu. 2013. On answering why-not questions in reverse skyline queries. In *29th IEEE International Conference on Data Engineering, ICDE 2013*. 973–984. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICDE.2013.6544890>
- [32] H. V. Jagadish, Adriane Chapman, Aaron Elkiss, Magesh Jayapandian, Yunyao Li, Arnab Nandi, and Cong Yu. 2007. Making database systems usable. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data, SIGMOD 2007*. 13–24. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1247480.1247483>
- [33] Victor M. Jiménez and Andrés Marzal. 1999. Computing the K Shortest Paths: A New Algorithm and an Experimental Comparison. In *Algorithm Engineering, 3rd International Workshop, WAE 1999*, Vol. 1668. 15–29. https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-48318-7_4
- [34] Jian Kang, Scott Freitas, Haichao Yu, Yinglong Xia, Nan Cao, and Hanghang Tong. 2018. X-Rank: Explainable Ranking in Complex Multi-Layered Networks. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management, CIKM 2018*. 1959–1962. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3269206.3269224>
- [35] Aristotelis Leventidis, Jiahui Zhang, Cody Dunne, Wolfgang Gatterbauer, H. V. Jagadish, and Mirek Riedewald. 2020. QueryVis: Logic-based Diagrams help Users Understand Complicated SQL Queries Faster. In *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data, SIGMOD 2020*. 2303–2318. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3318464.3389767>
- [36] Chenjie Li, Zhengjie Miao, Qitian Zeng, Boris Glavic, and Sudeepa Roy. 2021. Putting Things into Context: Rich Explanations for Query Answers using Join Graphs. In *Proceedings of the 2021 International Conference on Management of Data, SIGMOD 2021*. 1051–1063. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3448016.3459246>
- [37] Tie-Yan Liu. 2010. Learning to rank for information retrieval. In *Proceeding of the 33rd International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval, SIGIR 2010*. 904. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1835449.1835676>
- [38] Sports Reference LLC. 2024. Basketball-Reference.com - Basketball Statistics and History. <https://www.basketball-reference.com/>.
- [39] Sports Reference LLC. 2024. Calculating PER. <https://www.basketball-reference.com/about/per.html>.
- [40] Lijun Lyu and Avishek Anand. 2023. Listwise Explanations for Ranking Models Using Multiple Explainers. In *Advances in Information Retrieval - 45th European Conference on Information Retrieval, ECIR 2023, Proceedings, Part I*. 653–668. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-28244-7_41
- [41] Alexandra Meliou, Wolfgang Gatterbauer, Katherine F. Moore, and Dan Suciu. 2010. The Complexity of Causality and Responsibility for Query Answers and non-Answers. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 4, 1 (2010), 34–45. <https://doi.org/10.14778/1880172.1880176>
- [42] Alexandra Meliou, Wolfgang Gatterbauer, and Dan Suciu. 2011. Reverse Data Management. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 4, 12 (2011), 1490–1493. <https://doi.org/10.14778/3402755.3402803>
- [43] Alexandra Meliou and Dan Suciu. 2012. Tiresias: the database oracle for how-to queries. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data, SIGMOD 2012*. 337–348. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2213836.2213875>
- [44] Zhengjie Miao, Sudeepa Roy, and Jun Yang. 2019. Explaining Wrong Queries Using Small Examples. In *Proceedings of the 2019 International Conference on Management of Data, SIGMOD 2019*. 503–520. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3299869.3319866>
- [45] Venetia Pliatsika, Joao Fonseca, Tilun Wang, and Julia Stoyanovich. 2024. ShaRP: Explaining Rankings with Shapley Values. arXiv:2401.16744 [cs.AI]
- [46] Saladi Rahul and Yufei Tao. 2019. A Guide to Designing Top-k Indexes. *SIGMOD Rec.* 48, 2 (2019), 6–17. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3377330.3377332>
- [47] US News & World Report. 2022. 2022–2023 Best Global Universities Rankings. <https://www.usnews.com/education/best-global-universities/rankings>.
- [48] Lloyd S Shapley et al. 1953. A value for n-person games. (1953).
- [49] V. Srinivasan. 1976. Linear Programming Computational Procedures for Ordinal Regression. *J. ACM* 23, 3 (1976), 475–487. <https://doi.org/10.1145/321958.321969>
- [50] Quoc Trung Tran and Chee-Yong Chan. 2010. How to ConQueR why-not questions. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data, SIGMOD 2010*. 15–26. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1807167.1807172>
- [51] Nikolaos Tziavelis, Deepak Ajwani, Wolfgang Gatterbauer, Mirek Riedewald, and Xiaofeng Yang. 2020. Optimal Algorithms for Ranked Enumeration of Answers to Full Conjunctive Queries. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 13, 9 (2020), 1582–1597. <https://doi.org/10.14778/3397230.3397250>
- [52] Nikolaos Tziavelis, Wolfgang Gatterbauer, and Mirek Riedewald. 2021. Beyond Equi-joins: Ranking, Enumeration and Factorization. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 14, 11 (2021), 2599–2612. <https://doi.org/10.14778/3476249.3476306>
- [53] Nikolaos Tziavelis, Wolfgang Gatterbauer, and Mirek Riedewald. 2022. Toward Responsive DBMS: Optimal Join Algorithms, Enumeration, Factorization, Ranking, and Dynamic Programming. In *38th IEEE International Conference on Data Engineering, ICDE 2022*. 3205–3208. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICDE53745.2022.00299>
- [54] Manisha Verma and Debasis Ganguly. 2019. LIRME: Locally Interpretable Ranking Model Explanation. In *Proceedings of the 42nd International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval, SIGIR 2019*. 1281–1284. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3331184.3331377>
- [55] Akrivi Vlachou, Christos Doukeridis, Yannis Kotidis, and Kjetil Nørsvåg. 2010. Reverse top-k queries. In *2010 IEEE 26th International Conference on Data Engineering, ICDE 2010*. 365–376. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICDE.2010.5447890>
- [56] Akrivi Vlachou, Christos Doukeridis, Yannis Kotidis, and Kjetil Nørsvåg. 2011. Monochromatic and Bichromatic Reverse Top-k Queries. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* 23, 8 (2011), 1215–1229. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TKDE.2011.50>
- [57] Jun Xu and Hang Li. 2007. AdaRank: a boosting algorithm for information retrieval. In *Proceedings of the 30th Annual International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval, SIGIR 2007*. 391–398. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1277741.1277809>
- [58] Wenjian Xu, Zhian He, Eric Lo, and Chi-Yin Chow. 2016. Explaining Missing Answers to Top-k SQL Queries. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* 28, 8 (2016), 2071–2085. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TKDE.2016.2547398>
- [59] Ke Yang, Julia Stoyanovich, Abolfazl Asudeh, Bill Howe, H. V. Jagadish, and Gerome Miklau. 2018. A Nutritional Label for Rankings. In *Proceedings of the 2018 International Conference on Management of Data, SIGMOD 2018*. 1773–1776. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3183713.3193568>
- [60] Jin Y Yen. 1971. Finding the k shortest loopless paths in a network. *Management Science* 17, 11 (1971), 712–716.
- [61] Meike Zehlilke, Ke Yang, and Julia Stoyanovich. 2023. Fairness in Ranking, Part I: Score-Based Ranking. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 55, 6 (2023), 118:1–118:36. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3533379>