

BELLA: Black box model Explanations by Local Linear Approximations

Nedeljko Radulovic

LTCI, Télécom Paris,

Institut Polytechnique de Paris, Paris, France

NEDELJKO.RADULOVIC@TELECOM-PARIS.FR

Albert Bifet

AI Institute, University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand

LTCI, Télécom Paris, IP Paris, Paris, France

ABIFET@WAIKATO.AC.NZ

Fabian Suchanek

LTCI, Télécom Paris,

Institut Polytechnique de Paris, Paris, France

FABIAN.SUCHANEK@TELECOM-PARIS.FR

Abstract

In recent years, understanding the decision-making process of black-box models has become not only a legal requirement but also an additional way to assess their performance. However, the state of the art post-hoc interpretation approaches rely on synthetic data generation. This introduces uncertainty and can hurt the reliability of the interpretations. Furthermore, they tend to produce explanations that apply to only very few data points. This makes the explanations brittle and limited in scope. Finally, they provide scores that have no direct verifiable meaning. In this paper, we present BELLA, a deterministic model-agnostic post-hoc approach for explaining the individual predictions of regression black-box models. BELLA provides explanations in the form of a linear model trained in the feature space. Thus, its coefficients can be used directly to compute the predicted value from the feature values. Furthermore, BELLA maximizes the size of the neighborhood to which the linear model applies, so that the explanations are accurate, simple, general, and robust. BELLA can produce both factual and counterfactual explanations. Our user study confirms the importance of the desiderata we optimize, and our experiments show that BELLA outperforms the state-of-the-art approaches on these desiderata.

1. Introduction

Machine Learning (ML) and Artificial Intelligence (AI) models have been employed to handle tasks in various domains, including justice, healthcare, finance, self-driving cars, and many more. Consequently, legislative regulations have been proposed to protect interested parties and control the usage of these models. Examples are the General Data Protection Regulation of the European Union (Goodman & Flaxman, 2017) and, more recently, the AI act (European Commission, 2021), which stipulate *the right to an explanation* in situations where an AI system has been employed in a decision-making process. The main issue is that many ML models (such as deep neural networks, random forests, and XGBoost) are *opaque*, i.e. one cannot always assess the internal workings of the model to understand how decisions are made. This has led to the emergence of eXplainable Artificial Intelligence (xAI), a research field that aims to make the opaque models human-understandable. One avenue of research develops *post-hoc methods*, i.e., methods that explain a specific decision by the black box model after it has been taken. Usually, these methods build an interpretable surrogate-

model (e.g., a decision tree) that mimics the black box model, and that can be used to interpret the decision.

The most common metrics to evaluate the quality of such surrogate models are *fidelity*, *simplicity*, and *generality*. *Fidelity* measures how good the surrogate model is in mimicking the behavior of the black-box model. *Simplicity* (or, inversely, *complexity*) represents the measure of interpretability and usually favors shorter explanations. *Generality* (or *support*) measures the number of data points that the model applies to, and users tend to prefer more general explanations (Radulovic, Bifet, & Suchanek, 2021). Generality implicitly fosters a fourth desideratum, *robustness* (Alvarez-Melis & Jaakkola, 2018), which stipulates that similar data points should have similar explanations. In addition to these standard metrics, one line of research argues that good explanations should be *contrastive/counterfactual* (Miller, 2018; Wachter, Mittelstadt, & Russell, 2017). Such explanations aim to provide a set of modifications to the data point at hand that would entail a change in the decision. Contrary to the factual explanations, which answer the question “*Why P?*”, counterfactual explanations answer the question “*Why P rather than Q?*”.

Several approaches exist to provide post-hoc explanations. However, most of them have been naturally tailored for classification tasks, and only few of them can be applied to regression tasks. The most prominent approaches of these latter ones are LIME (Ribeiro, Singh, & Guestrin, 2016) and SHAP (Lundberg & Lee, 2017). Even though they have been widely adopted because of their ease of use, they both rely on random feature perturbations that introduce a level of uncertainty that can affect their trustworthiness (Zhang, Song, Sun, Tan, & Udell, 2019; Slack, Hilgard, Jia, Singh, & Lakkaraju, 2020). Moreover, while these approaches provide accurate explanations, they do not optimize for their generality. Thus, they tend to provide explanations that apply to very few data points. Finally, the explanations by LIME and SHAP are not *verifiable*: they provide intuitive scores for the importance of the different features, but they do not allow the user to actually compute the predicted value from feature values. This means that the user cannot see how this explanation would apply to neighboring data points.

With our approach we aim to remedy these shortcomings: We present BELLA (Black-box Explanations by Local Linear Approximations), which is, to the best of our knowledge, the first deterministic model-agnostic post-hoc approach for explaining the individual predictions of a regression. It has the following properties:

- BELLA learns local linear surrogates that are not only *simple*, but also accurately mimic the black-box regression model with high *fidelity* and high *generality*.
- BELLA produces explanations that are *verifiable*, i.e., that humans can use to compute the predicted value from the feature values.
- BELLA can provide both *factual* and *counterfactual* explanations (given a reference value).
- BELLA is *deterministic*, and relies only on actually existing data points. Therefore, it can be used without access to the predictive model, and can interpret any real-valued variable of a tabular dataset.

We perform an extensive evaluation on several popular datasets from the UCI Machine Learning Repository and Penn Machine Learning Benchmarks, and show that BELLA outperforms other state-of-the-art methodologies. The rest of the paper is organised as follows: Section 2 discusses the current state of the art. Section 3 presents our new method, BELLA. Section 4 evaluates our method on several datasets and compares it to several state-of-the-art methods, before Section 5 concludes.

2. Related Work

Explainable AI has received a lot of attention lately in the research community, and several survey papers discuss recent approaches (Beaudouin, Bloch, Bounie, Cl  men  on, d’Alch   Buc, Eagan, Maxwell, Mozharovskyi, & Parekh, 2020; Guidotti, Monreale, Ruggieri, Turini, Giannotti, & Pedreschi, 2018b; Adadi & Berrada, 2018; Murdoch, Singh, Kumbier, Abbasi-Asl, & Yu, 2019; Burkart & Huber, 2021). The two main groups of approaches are *ante-hoc* and *post-hoc*. The ante-hoc group uses models that are interpretable by design: decision trees (Breiman, Friedman, Stone, & Olshen, 1984), rule-based models, or linear models. One school of thought argues that these methods should be preferred for high stake tasks (Rudin, 2018). The post-hoc approaches, in contrast, add interpretability to a given black-box model. Among these, the *model-specific* post-hoc approaches rely on the structure of the black-box model, while the *model-agnostic* approaches can interpret any black-box model. For this purpose, the latter typically build a *surrogate model*, i.e., a model that mimics the black box model, but that is interpretable by design, such as decision trees (Bastani, Kim, & Bastani, 2017; Boz, 2002; Craven & Shavlik, 1996; Johansson & Niklasson, 2009; Radulovic et al., 2021), linear models (Ribeiro et al., 2016; Lundberg & Lee, 2017; White & Garcez, 2019; Parekh, Mozharovskyi, & d’Alch   Buc, 2021), or rule-based models (Ribeiro, Singh, & Guestrin, 2018; Lakkaraju, Bach, & Leskovec, 2016; Guidotti, Monreale, Ruggieri, Pedreschi, Turini, & Giannotti, 2018a). Another categorization of interpretable methods can be made based on the level of interpretation: *global* methods provide an interpretation of the black-box model behavior on the whole space, while *local* models provide an interpretation for a single data point.

In this paper, we propose a *model-agnostic post-hoc local* method for explaining regression models, i.e., we aim to provide an explanation for a given real-valued decision by any type of model for a given data point. One approach to deal with regression models is to adjust the methods for classification models (Torgo & Gama, 1996), e.g., by discretization or clustering. However, this loses information and may require domain knowledge. Therefore several approaches have been developed specifically for regression models. The most popular methods are LIME (Ribeiro et al., 2016) and SHAP (SHapley Additive exPlanations) (Lundberg & Lee, 2017). SHAP introduces a game theory approach to compute the contribution of each feature. SHAP uses all features, which yields explanations that score high on fidelity but low on simplicity. LIME, in contrast, takes the length of the explanation as input. In this way, LIME is able to deliver explanations that are both simple and accurate. LIME trains a linear model on synthetic data points generated by feature perturbations. It then yields the most relevant features with their weights. However, neither LIME nor SHAP optimize the *generality* of the explanations: the explanations typically apply only to very few data points. With our method, BELLA, we do not just achieve generality, but we also outperform SHAP and LIME on simplicity. Another drawback of the explanations provided by LIME and SHAP is that they are not *verifiable*: They do not provide a direct relation between the feature value and its contribution to the predicted value. BELLA, in contrast, explains the predictions through a linear combination of the values of the input features, so that users can not just verify the explanation for a given prediction, but also apply the explanation to other data points in the neighbourhood.

DLIME (Zafar & Khan, 2019) is a deterministic variant of LIME that provides stable and consistent explanations. However, it requires extensive manual input, as the user has to provide the number of clusters for the hierarchical clustering step and the number of neighbours for the KNN step of the method, as well as the length of the explanation. As such, DLIME is not well suited for

regression tasks, and was thus applied only to classification. Furthermore, DLIME improves only the stability of LIME explanations, not the lack of generality.

Another group of approaches computes *counterfactual* explanations. One such method (White & Garcez, 2019) uses the idea of *b-counterfactuals*, i.e., the minimal change in the feature to gauge the prediction of the complex model. This method applies only to classification tasks. Other work (Dandl, Molnar, Binder, & Bischl, 2020) uses Multi-Objective Optimization to compute counterfactual explanations, both for classification and regression. Both approaches, however, can compute only counterfactual explanations, not both factual and counterfactual explanations like BELLA.

All of the above approaches either require extensive user input (like DLIME) or rely on the perturbation-based sampling of synthetic data for training a local surrogate model. This perturbation-based sampling is a source of uncertainty, which can lead to different explanations for the same input data point (Zhang et al., 2019). The synthetic data points can also be off-manifold or out of distribution (Slack et al., 2020). These data points fall in the part of the feature space that is unknown to the black-box model and may lead to wrong conclusions about its behavior.

With BELLA, we remove the perturbation-based sampling as the main source of uncertainty. In contrast to all of these works, our approach is deterministic and provides local surrogate models trained using only real, already existing data: the same data that has been used for training the black-box model. This has the side effect that our method can be used even in the absence of a black box model, just on a tabular dataset with a real-valued variable to explain.

3. Methodology

3.1 Goal

We assume a tabular dataset $T \subset F_1 \times \dots \times F_n$, where each F_i is a set of *feature values*. We also assume a function $Y : T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that yields, for each $x \in T$, a *target value* $Y(x) \in \mathbb{R}$. These target values may, e.g., have been produced by a black-box model, in which case the target value is a *prediction*. Consider now one data point $x \in T$ with its prediction $Y(x)$. We aim to compute a local *explanation* in the following sense (Das & Rad, 2020):

Definition 3.1. *An explanation is additional meta information, generated by an external algorithm or by the machine learning model itself, to describe the feature importance or relevance of an input instance towards a particular output classification.*

If the target value was produced by a black-box model, we cannot be sure post-hoc that the features we identify really contributed to the computation of the target value (the model may just as well have thrown a dice, independently of any feature values). However, if several data points with these or similar feature values produce a similar prediction, we can use abductive reasoning to infer that these features may have contributed to the prediction, and that, hence, the features constitute an explanation. This is in fact common in the literature (Ribeiro et al., 2016; Lundberg & Lee, 2017; Radulovic et al., 2021; Ignatiev, Narodytska, & Marques-Silva, 2019).

Desiderata. Several properties of “good” explanations have been proposed. Some of them, such as plausibility and accordance with prior beliefs, require human evaluation. Among the criteria that do not, we commonly find (Miller, 2019; Guidotti et al., 2018b; Burkart & Huber, 2021; Molnar, 2018; Radulovic et al., 2021):

- **Fidelity**, which measures to what degree the explanation explains the predicted value (and not rather some other value that is not predicted). In the case of surrogate models, fidelity is the accuracy of the surrogate model wrt. the black-box model (Y in our formalization).
- **Simplicity**, which measures how easy it is to understand the explanation. Simplicity typically aims to reduce the number of features in an explanation.
- **Generality**, which measures the size of the domain (or the number of data points) where the explanation applies.
- **Robustness**, which measures how similar the explanations of similar data points are.

Our method BELLA optimizes these four desiderata. In contrast to other state-of-the-art methods, BELLA does not need access to the black box model that produced the predictions. It can work directly on the training dataset of that model. This has several advantages: First, BELLA is model-agnostic. It can work with predictions of any machine learning model. Second, BELLA can be used even if the data has been merely observed and not produced by a model at all. For example, BELLA can be used to understand variables such as housing prices, which were not predicted, but simply observed. Third, BELLA avoids random perturbation-based sampling, which makes the approach deterministic. This is a very important property as it removes the uncertainty and increases the consistency of the explanations (Zhang et al., 2019; Slack et al., 2020). In contrast to other approaches, BELLA’s explanations allow the user to compute the explained value directly from the feature weights, which makes our feature weights interpretable and verifiable. Finally, if a reference value is supplied, BELLA can provide counterfactual explanations.

3.2 BELLA

Given a data point $x \in T$ with label y , BELLA outputs a linear equation $y = w_1 \cdot f_1 + w_2 \cdot f_2 + \dots + w_n \cdot f_n + w_0$, where w_i are real-valued regression coefficients and f_i are feature values. Such an equation tells the user (1) what the important features are and (2) how their can be used to compute the predicted value. To find this equation, BELLA proceeds in three steps:

1. Compute the distance of x to the other points in T .
2. Conduct a linear search to find the best neighborhood of x , according to a defined metric.
3. Train a sparse linear model on that neighborhood, and propose this model as an explanation.

The pseudo-code of BELLA is given in Algorithm 1: We first compute the distances between the input data point and the other data points. Then, we conduct a search for a neighbourhood of data points that produce the best linear model. That linear model is then returned as explanation.

Algorithm 1 BELLA

Input: Dataset T with labels Y
 Labeled data point $x \in T$
 1: $d \leftarrow \text{ComputeDistances}(x, T)$
 2: $L, N \leftarrow \text{OptimalNeighborhoodSearch}(x, T, d)$
 3: **return** L, N

Step 1: Computing the distances. To compute the neighborhood of the input data point, we need a distance measure. A good starting point is to have all numerical features on the same scale so that each feature contributes to the distance measure in the same range. Therefore, we first standardize all numerical features to have a mean of 0 and a standard-deviation of 1. To compute the distances, we employ the generalized distance function (Harikumar & Surya, 2015), which consists of three

separate distance measures to account for numerical, categorical, and binary data types, as follows:

$$d(x_1, x_2) = \sum_{i=1}^{m_n} d_n(x_{1i}, x_{2i}) + \sum_{j=1}^{m_c} d_c(x_{1j}, x_{2j}) + \sum_{k=1}^{m_b} d_b(x_{1k}, x_{2k}). \quad (1)$$

Here, m_n , m_c and m_b are the number of numerical, categorical, and binary features, respectively. The distance measure for the numerical attributes d_n is the $L1$ norm $d_n(x_1, x_2) = |x_1 - x_2|$, which is preferred over $L2$, as it is more robust to outliers (Hopcroft & Kannan, 2014). For categorical features, d_c is the distance measure (Ahmad & Dey, 2007), which takes into account the distribution of values and their co-occurrence with values of other attributes. The distance between two values x and y of an attribute A_i with respect to attribute A_j is given by:

$$\delta^{ij}(x, y) = P(A_j \in \omega | A_i = x) + P(A_j \notin \omega | A_i = y) - 1. \quad (2)$$

Here, $P(A_j \in \omega | A_i = x)$ is the conditional probability that attribute A_j will take a value from the set ω given that the attribute A_i takes the value x . ω is a subset of all possible values of attribute A_j that maximizes the sum of the probabilities. Since both probabilities can take values from $[0, 1]$, we subtract 1 in order to arrive at $\delta^{ij}(x, y) \in [0, 1]$. Lastly, for binary features, we use the Hamming distance:

$$d_h(a, b) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } a = b \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

In Line 1 of Algorithm 1, the function *ComputeDistances* returns the distances by Equation 1.

Step 2: Optimal Neighborhood Search. After computing the distances, we proceed with the exploration of the neighborhood of the input data point x . The goal is to find a set of points, closest to x according to the distance measure, that will serve as a training set for a local surrogate model. Several common techniques could be considered to that end, including kNN, K-Means, and other distance-based clustering methods. In our case, however, we aim to find a neighborhood such that a linear regression model trained on that neighborhood represents an accurate local approximation of the black-box model. Hence, the quality of the neighborhood is proportional to the quality of the performance of the linear model fitted on it. Regression evaluation metrics are numerous, each with their strengths and weaknesses. Common drawbacks of these metrics are missing interpretability, sensitivity to outliers and near-zero values, divisions by zero, missing bounds, and missing symmetry. We find that the *Berry-Mielke universal R value* \mathfrak{R} (Berry & Mielke Jr, 1988) avoids most of these pitfalls. \mathfrak{R} represents the measure of agreement between raters and it is a generalization of Cohen’s kappa (Cohen, 1960). \mathfrak{R} measures how much better the model is compared to a naive one (e.g., to a random predictor). \mathfrak{R} takes values from the range $[0, 1]$, and it can be interpreted easily: If \mathfrak{R} is equal to 0, the model performance is equal to the one of the random model and if it is 1, then the model has perfect performance. \mathfrak{R} is defined as $\mathfrak{R} = 1 - \frac{\delta}{\mu}$, where δ and μ are defined as:

$$\delta = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \Delta(\hat{y}_i - y_i), \quad \mu = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \Delta(\hat{y}_j - y_i). \quad (4)$$

Here, n is the number of samples, y_i is the actual target value, \hat{y}_i is the predicted value, and $\Delta(\cdot)$ represents the distance function between the true and the predicted value. The original work by (Berry




Figure 1: Left: an explanation for a data point x that is too specific, applying only to a very small neighborhood. Right: An explanation that applies to a larger neighborhood, which is what we aim at.

& Mielke Jr, 1988) uses the Euclidean distance, but later works (Janson & Olsson, 2001, 2004) propose to use the squared Euclidean distance instead, because this distance is equivalent to the variance of the variable, which further improves the interpretability of \mathfrak{R} . We follow this argumentation, and use $\Delta(x, y) = (x - y)^2$. This definition implies that Δ is in fact equal to the Mean Squared Error (MSE). Thus, by optimizing \mathfrak{R} , we are actually optimizing the fidelity of a local model.

Our next goal is to avoid explanations that are too specific, i.e., explanations that apply to very small neighborhoods, as in Figure 1 (left). We rather aim for explanations that are at the same time accurate and general (Figure 1 (right)). Therefore we include the size of the neighborhood in the optimization function. One way to do this is to maximize the lower bound of the confidence interval of \mathfrak{R} . According to its definition (Equation 3.2), \mathfrak{R} is a linear transformation of δ , and hence the test of significance for δ is the same as for \mathfrak{R} (Berry & Mielke Jr, 1988). The lower and upper bounds for the confidence interval of \mathfrak{R} are given by:

$$CI_{\mathfrak{R}} = \overline{\mathfrak{R}} \pm MOE_{\mathfrak{R}} = 1 - \frac{\overline{\delta} \mp MOE_{\delta}}{\mu}. \quad (5)$$

Here, MOE stands for the Margin of Error. From Equation 5, it follows that computing the lower bound of \mathfrak{R} is analogous to computing the upper bound of δ . Therefore, we can compute the margin of error for δ as $MOE_{\delta} = t \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}}$, where σ is the standard deviation of the sample, n is the sample size and t represents the critical value from the t-distribution. We use the t-distribution because it is adapted small sample sizes, which is what we encounter when we grow the neighborhood. The distribution converges to the normal distribution as the sample size increases.

Due to the non-monotonic nature of the \mathfrak{R} value, we have to explore the whole space to maximize its lower bound. We employ a linear search algorithm (Algorithm 2) to this end. It receives as input a labeled data point x that is to be explained, a labeled training set T , and a vector of distances between x and each point in the training set T . We sort the training set by increasing distance to x , train a linear model on the first i data points for increasing i , and return the set of neighbors for which the lower bound of \mathfrak{R} is maximal.

As the neighbourhood is very small in the beginning, the training easily lead to overfitting. Therefore, we impose a constraint on the minimum number of observations. It is known (Austin & Steyerberg, 2015) that a minimum of 2 observations per feature for multiple linear regression ensures that the estimation of regression coefficients exhibits less than 10% relative bias. Therefore, we set the minimum neighborhood size to be twice the number of features. (If the number of observations is smaller, we set the minimum size to 0). Let us now discuss how we build the local surrogate model (Line 4 of Algorithm 2).

Algorithm 2 Optimal Neighborhood Search

Input: Labeled data point $x \in T$
 Dataset T with labels Y
 Distances $d : T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of the data points to x

- 1: Sort T by ascending d
- 2: $n \leftarrow$ number of features in T
- 3: $max\mathfrak{R}_{lb} \leftarrow 0, bestN \leftarrow 0, bestL \leftarrow \emptyset$
- 4: **for** $i = 2n$ to $|T|$ **do**
- 5: $L \leftarrow LocalSurrogateModel(T[0 : i])$
- 6: **if** $\mathfrak{R}_{lb}(L) > max\mathfrak{R}_{lb}$ **then**
- 7: $max\mathfrak{R}_{lb} \leftarrow \mathfrak{R}_{lb}(L), bestN \leftarrow i, bestL \leftarrow L$
- 8: **end if**
- 9: **end for**
- 10: **return** $bestL, T[0:bestN]$

Step 3: Building a local surrogate model. Similar to several previous approaches (Ribeiro et al., 2016; Lundberg & Lee, 2017), we use a linear regression model as a local approximation of the black-box model. While the other approaches rely on random sampling and feature perturbations, BELLA relies only on available, real data points, which makes it deterministic: for the same input, BELLA provides the same output.

As we have already discussed in Algorithm 2, we set the limit on the minimum number of data points in the neighbourhood to $2n$ (n being the number of features), to prevent overfitting. To further improve the generalization of the linear model and also reduce its size, we use regularization. In terms of model (feature) selection, it has been shown that regularization, especially $L1$ regularization (e.g. Lasso (Hastie, Tibshirani, Friedman, & Friedman, 2009)) is able to select a nearly perfect subset of variables in a wide range of situations. The only condition for this to work is that there are no highly collinear variables (Candès & Plan, 2009), which can significantly reduce the precision of estimated regression coefficients. To remove highly collinear features, we compute the *variance inflation factor* (VIF), and, following a rule of thumb (Stine, 1995), adopt 10 as the cut-off value for the VIF. After removing highly collinear features, the next step is to train a linear model with Lasso regularization. Lasso regularization adds a penalty term in the form of the sum of absolute values of regression coefficients. The objective function that Lasso regression is solving is given by $\min_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p} (\|y - \beta X\|_2^2 + \lambda \|\beta\|_1)$, where λ is the shrinkage parameter. This provides a sparse model, by forcing some coefficients to be zero. Removing some features ensures a better generalization, and results in simpler, and thus more comprehensible explanations. On the other hand, coefficients obtained by minimizing the Lasso objective function are biased towards zero. Therefore, Lasso is preferred for model selection rather than for prediction. The common strategy is to train an Ordinary

callfail	complains	sublength	charge	seconds	freque	freqSMS	distnums	contractual	active	age	Commercial value
-0.35	0	0.28	-0.61	2.18	1.60	-0.65	0.90	0	1	-0.11	551.08

Table 1: An example customer of the Iranian Churn dataset (Jafari-Marandi et al., 2020)

Least Squares (OLS) linear model on the subset of variables selected by Lasso. This corresponds to a special variation of the relaxed Lasso (Meinshausen, 2007), with $\phi = 0$.

To determine the value of the shrinkage coefficient λ , we use 5-fold cross-validation (CV). To preserve the deterministic nature we perform CV on adjacent slices of the dataset, without random shuffles. CV selects the best model in terms of a prediction error. Since the goal of this step is model selection, we want to avoid choosing λ too small, and hence we apply the common one-standard-error rule. According to this rule, the most parsimonious model is the one whose error is no more than one standard error above the error of the best model (Hastie et al., 2009).

Once we have obtained the most parsimonious model, i.e., the best set of features, we train the final local surrogate model as an OLS model using the features selected by Lasso. This procedure is described in Algorithm 3. The algorithm returns a local linear model, which provides the feature weights through its regression coefficients.

Algorithm 3 Train Local Surrogate Model

Input: Neighborhood $N \subset T$


- 1: $F \leftarrow$ the set of all features in N
 - 2: $F' \leftarrow \{f | f \in F \wedge VIF(f) < 10.0\}$ \triangleright Remove collinear features
 - 3: $Features_{Lasso} \leftarrow Lasso(cv = 5, features = F')$
 - 4: **return** $OLS(Features_{Lasso})$
-

Providing an explanation. As the final result, BELLA outputs the OLS model computed by Algorithm 3. The explanation presented to the user is given as (1) the base value of the model (intercept), (2) the feature contributions, and (3) the number of neighbors that the model applies to.

As an example, consider the Iranian Churn dataset (Jafari-Marandi, Denton, Idris, Smith, & Keramati, 2020). This dataset contains the (anonymized) customers of a telecommunication company. The goal is to predict the commercial value (lifetime revenue) of the customer to the company. Each customer is represented by characteristics such as age, subscription length, the amount of usage of the service of the company, the satisfaction with the service provided, etc.

Let us now consider a customer, with the characteristics shown in the Table 1. All numerical features have been standardized to have mean value equal to 0 and standard deviation equal to 1. This is why the age, e.g., has a negative value. In general, the positive values are higher than the average feature value while negative ones are below the average. Assume that a black box model predicted the commercial value of 550.86. The explanation that BELLA can provide for this prediction is shown in Figure 2. The base value is the output of the model when all inputs are set to the mean value, i.e., to zero (having in mind that the data has been standardized). Beyond that, each bar shows the total contribution of each feature to the predicted value: The more the customer phones (variable *seconds*), the more revenue the company generates. The age (which is below average for this particular customer), likewise, has a small positive impact. The number of SMS, in contrast, (variable *freqSMS*) impacts the revenue negatively. Finally, the number of distinct phone numbers called (variable *distnum*) has a small negative impact. These sizes of the bars are easy to interpret: The size of each bar is equal to the value of the feature multiplied by the weight

Figure 2: Explanation example.



The value predicted by the model is **551.08** and the explained value is **557.68**. This explanation applies to **476** other instances.

computed by our method. Their sum is then directly equivalent to the explained value:

$$y = 458.47 + 190.27 \times seconds - 102.91 \times age + 480.08 \times freqSMS - 17.71 \times distNums$$

This computation applies to all data points that the explanation covers, i.e., to all points in the neighborhood of the input data point. We also provide the number of these points, as a measure for the generality of the explanation (the current instance and 476 others in our example).

Counterfactual explanations. BELLA can provide not just factual explanations, but also counterfactual explanations. Counterfactual explanations provide information about a (minimal) change needed to alter the class label predicted by the black-box model. This definition is evidently geared towards the classification scenario, as there is no such notion of class membership in the regression task. Therefore, counterfactual explanations can work only with additional input from the user. Consider again the Iranian churn dataset (Jafari-Marandi et al., 2020): The commercial value of the customer of a telecommunications company is determined based on the customer characteristics such as age, subscription length, etc,

If, for a given customer, the black-box model predicts a commercial value of \$300, an analyst may ask why the model predicted \$300 instead of, say, \$1000, and what has to be changed in order to arrive at a value of \$1000. In this case, \$1000 is the additional input from the user, which we call the *reference point*. A counterfactual explanation should suggest a set of changes that should be applied on the original data point to reach the given reference value. This information cannot be acquired from the local linear model alone. Therefore, we select candidates, i.e. data points whose target value is equal to the reference value (or in a close neighborhood ϵ), to compute the counterfactual explanation. If a data point with a target value equal to the reference value doesn't exist in the dataset, ϵ represents the maximum permitted deviation from the reference value. We set the default value of ϵ to 5% of the reference value. There can be multiple candidates x_{ref} for a counterfactual explanation. To find the best one, we optimize two criteria: the distance between the given data point and the candidate, and the amount of change needed. The first criterion will favor

candidates that are in the vicinity of the given data point. The second criterion controls the amount of change applied.

To alter the outcome, one can usually either apply a small change to several features, or a big change to few features. The second approach is risky: without human intervention, we can end up with a set of features that are difficult or impossible to change. In the commercial value example, it would be of little use if the counterfactual explanation suggested to change the age of the given customer. On the other hand, a counterfactual explanation that suggests smaller changes across multiple features has more chances to include other features (such as frequency of use, or the number of SMS messages) that are a bit more realistic to change. Therefore, we aim to minimize the average amount of change and suggest smaller adjustments to multiple features. This yields the following objective function:

$$\min_{x_i \in S} \left(d(x, x_i) + \frac{d(x, x')}{|\Delta|} \right) \quad (6)$$

where x_i is a counterfactual candidate data point, d is a distance measure defined in Equation 1, x' represents the modified data point x according to the counterfactual explanation and $|\Delta|$ is the number of features that have been modified. The modified data point, x' , represents the counterfactual explanation. This process is described in Algorithm 4. It takes as input the labeled dataset T , a labeled datapoint $x \in T$, a reference value $y_{ref} \in \mathbb{R}$, and a permitted deviation from the reference value (which defaults to 5% of y_{ref}). The first step is to choose the set of counterfactual candidates X_c that have the target value in the ϵ neighbourhood of the reference value y_{ref} . For each x_i among these candidates, we compute the explanation using BELLA. This explanation gives us a set of features, and the proposed modification of x is to set all these features of x to the values given by x_i . Among these proposed modifications, we choose the one that minimizes the objective function in Equation 6.

Algorithm 4 Computing a counterfactual explanation

Input: Dataset T of data points x_i with labels y_i
 Labeled data point $x \in T$
 A reference value $y_{ref} \in \mathbb{R}$
 Deviation from reference value $\epsilon = 0.05 \cdot y_{ref}$

- 1: $X_c \leftarrow \{x_i \in T | y_i \in [y_{ref} - \epsilon, y_{ref} + \epsilon]\}$
- 2: **for** $x_i \in X_c$ **do**
- 3: $L_i, N_i \leftarrow \text{BELLA}(T, x_i)$ ▷ Algorithm 1
- 4: $x'_i \leftarrow x_i$ *modified according to* L_i
- 5: **end for**
- 6: $x_{ref} \leftarrow \operatorname{argmin}_{x'_i} \left(d(x, x_i) + \frac{d(x, x'_i)}{|\Delta|} \right)$
- 7: **return** x_{ref}

Figure 3 shows how BELLA computes a counterfactual explanation for the data point x_1 and the reference value y_{ref} . BELLA first identifies a candidate data point x_{ref} , whose target value is equal to the reference value y_{ref} . Then, it computes the local surrogate model for this candidate (straight blue line). The local surrogate model selects the set of important features whose values should be altered. In this simple example, there is just one feature, x , and the data point is just a one-dimensional real value x_1 . Consequently, the counterfactual explanation suggests changing the




Figure 3: Counterfactual explanation using the reference point

value of that feature x from x_1 to x_{ref} to achieve the reference value. In more complex scenarios, the surrogate model identifies the most important features to alter.

4. Experiments

We performed experiments on multiple datasets from the UCI Machine Learning Repository (Dua & Graff, 2017) and Penn Machine Learning Benchmarks (Romano, Le, La Cava, Gregg, Goldberg, Chakraborty, Ray, Himmelstein, Fu, & Moore, 2021). The characteristics of the datasets are given in Table 2. Among them is also a high-dimensional dataset, Superconductivity, with 81 features. BELLA does not make any assumptions about the internal architecture of the black-box model, and we show that it works with different families of models. For each dataset, we train a random forest (with 1000 trees), and a neural network (with one hidden layer with 500 nodes). All categorical features have been one-hot encoded and all numerical features have been standardized. For BELLA, we set the step size in the linear search to 1%. The step size determines the granularity of the neighborhood search: Smaller step sizes produce more accurate models, but increase the running time. We use an α value of 95% for the confidence interval, as is most commonly used. Increasing the confidence interval to 99% results in larger generality and lower fidelity, as it puts more weight on the number of samples in the neighborhood.

We compare the performance of our method to LIME (Ribeiro et al., 2016) and SHAP (Lundberg & Lee, 2017). We did not compare to systems like LORE (Guidotti et al., 2018a) or DLIME (Zafar & Khan, 2019) because these are designed for classification models, and cannot explain regression models natively. We use the implementations by the authors¹². Our method is implemented in Python. For the black-box models, we use the implementations of `scikit-learn` (Pedregosa, Varoquaux, Gramfort, et al., 2011). All code and the data for BELLA and the experiments will be made publicly available on Github and are part of the submission material.

4.1 Experimental results

We compare BELLA’s performance against the competitors on the metrics of fidelity, generality, simplicity, and robustness (Miller, 2019; Guidotti et al., 2018b; Burkart & Huber, 2021; Molnar, 2018). Additionally we evaluate the counterfactual explanations provided by our approach. We

1. <https://github.com/marcotcr/lime>

2. <https://github.com/slundberg/shap>

Table 2: Regression Datasets

Dataset	Features	Num.	Cat.	Instances
Auto MPG	7	6	1	393
Bike	12	9	3	8761
Concrete	8	8	0	1031
Servo	4	0	4	168
Electrical	12	12	0	10000
Superconductivity	81	81	0	21263
White Wine Quality	11	11	0	4898
Real estate valuation	5	5	0	414
Wind	14	14	0	6574
CPU activity	12	12	0	8192
Echocardiogram	9	6	3	17496
Iranian Churn	11	8	3	3150

show the experimental results with the random forest and neural network as black-box models in this section.

Fidelity. For fidelity, we compute the Root Mean Squared Error (RMSE) of the local surrogate models. We compare the values computed by the local surrogate models to the values predicted by the black-box models. Lower values of RMSE mean better performance. The Table 3 shows the comparison of fidelity of different explanation methods. As expected, SHAP always has an error of 0. This is because it provides exact explanations that apply only to a single data point. Both LIME and BELLA explanations, in contrast, come with some error. Still, BELLA is more accurate than LIME in most of the cases.

Generality. For generality, we compute to how many data points the explanation applies beyond the input instance (as a percentage of all data points in the training set). For BELLA, we simply return the size of the neighborhood. For LIME, we count how many data points satisfy the conditions given by its explanation.

The results are shown in Table 4. For SHAP, the size of the neighborhood is always 0. This is because SHAP provides feature contributions that are specific for the given data point, and there is no way to apply these explanations to other data points. LIME’s explanations are more general. Still, they are vastly less general than the explanations of BELLA. This is because BELLA explicitly optimizes for generality, while LIME does not.

Thus, the experiments show that BELLA outperforms LIME in terms of fidelity and generality for the same number of features included in the explanation. On the other hand, SHAP outperforms BELLA on fidelity, and BELLA outperforms SHAP on generality. We will now see that BELLA outperforms SHAP also on simplicity and robustness.

Simplicity is most commonly measured by the number of features that an explanation contains (fewer is better). Table 5 shows the comparison. LIME has the same size of explanations as BELLA. This is because LIME takes this parameter as input and we set it to the size of the explanation provided by BELLA. SHAP constantly provides longer explanations than BELLA – even though we exclude the features that have a Shap value of zero. This is because SHAP optimizes exclusively for fidelity, at the expense of generality and simplicity. From Tables 3, 4, and 5, we can

Table 3: Fidelity comparison (RMSE – smaller is better)

Dataset	RF as black-box			NN as black-box			SHAP
	BB	LIME	BELLA	BB	LIME	BELLA	
Auto MPG	3.44	2.10	1.88	2.30	2.66	1.08	0.00
Bike	197.33	421.50	245.30	235.21	520.18	228.44	0.00
Concrete	4.09	7.79	4.84	4.75	14.17	4.68	0.00
Servo	0.43	0.61	0.66	0.34	1.22	1.05	0.00
Electrical	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.00
Superconductivity	8.96	20.86	15.96	11.03	28.82	12.67	0.00
White Wine Quality	0.62	0.41	0.37	0.70	0.46	0.25	0.00
Real estate valuation	7.13	5.59	4.15	7.91	6.84	1.87	0.00
Wind	3.12	1.86	1.30	3.07	4.73	1.87	0.00
CPU activity	3.14	18.86	3.72	2.97	30.86	1.88	0.00
Echocardiogram	10.97	4.24	4.06	12.18	10.98	3.89	0.00
Iranian Churn	17.39	214.10	23.91	3.27	242.25	19.29	0.00

Table 4: Generality comparison (% - larger is better)

Dataset	RF as black-box			NN as black-box		
	LIME	SHAP	BELLA	LIME	SHAP	BELLA
Auto MPG	4.25	0.00	77.05	10.08	0.00	37.27
Bike	1.30	0.00	39.99	4.14	0.00	32.11
Concrete	0.33	0.00	23.26	1.10	0.00	21.55
Servo	4.63	0.00	81.96	16.82	0.00	76.31
Electrical	0.01	0.00	16.89	0.02	0.00	21.61
Superconductivity	0.01	0.00	53.55	0.01	0.00	30.25
White Wine Quality	0.68	0.00	65.31	0.83	0.00	15.34
Real estate valuation	2.52	0.00	55.38	3.75	0.00	16.21
Wind	0.37	0.00	99.97	0.24	0.00	94.00
CPU activity	0.75	0.00	51.63	0.71	0.00	17.50
Echocardiogram	0.31	0.00	86.40	0.00	0.00	83.76
Iranian Churn	1.50	0.00	12.49	0.65	0.00	6.41

see that at the same level of simplicity, BELLA provides more general and more accurate explanations than LIME. BELLA provides less accurate explanations than SHAP, but at the same time, BELLA’s explanations are vastly more general and much simpler.

Robustness measures how similar the explanations for close data points are. To measure robustness, we first define the distance between two explanations:

$$Explanation\ distance = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{|\beta_{1i} - \beta_{2i}|}{|\beta_{1i}| + |\beta_{2i}|}. \tag{7}$$

3. The number of features includes the binary (*dummy*) features generated by *one-hot* encoding of categorical features.

Table 5: Simplicity comparison (smaller values are better). LIME requires the explanation size as input, and we give it the size of the explanation computed by BELLA.

Black-box model	Average explanation size			
	Random Forest		Neural Network	
Dataset	SHAP	BELLA/LIME	SHAP	BELLA/LIME
Auto MPG ³	8.00	3.90	9.00	4.90
Bike	12.00	7.43	11.63	7.30
Concrete	8.00	5.40	8.00	5.42
Servo	10.12	6.76	13.06	5.06
Electrical	12.00	8.06	12.00	8.63
Superconductivity	48.90	15.50	77.97	13.10
White Wine Quality	11.00	6.70	11.00	7.54
Real estate valuation	5.00	3.76	5.00	4.05
Wind	13.63	7.82	13.65	9.47
CPU activity	12.00	10.35	12.00	10.80
Echocardiogram	9.00	5.65	9.00	8.23
Iranian Churn	9.19	5.56	9.15	5.65
Average	13.24	7.24	15.96	7.51

Table 6: Robustness comparison (larger is better)

Black-box model	Random Forest			Neural Network		
	LIME	SHAP	BELLA	LIME	SHAP	BELLA
Auto MPG	0.87	0.67	0.70	0.78	0.68	0.80
Bike	0.77	0.66	0.79	0.79	0.70	0.76
Concrete	0.76	0.65	0.69	0.78	0.72	0.65
Servo	0.90	0.79	0.75	0.77	0.59	0.64
Electrical	0.82	0.50	0.81	0.63	0.59	0.76
Superconductivity	0.76	0.85	0.80	0.89	0.87	0.93
White Wine Quality	0.62	0.51	0.77	0.67	0.56	0.65
Real estate valuation	0.63	0.69	0.85	0.70	0.74	0.65
Wind	0.71	0.63	0.98	0.64	0.62	0.99
CPU activity	0.52	0.69	0.84	0.46	0.73	0.83
Echocardiogram	0.81	0.52	0.99	0.75	0.66	0.96
Iranian Churn	0.75	0.79	0.78	0.62	0.79	0.76
Average	0.74	0.66	0.81	0.71	0.69	0.78

Table 7: RMSE of BELLA’s counterfactual explanations compared to RMSE of factual explanations (smaller is better)

Dataset	RF as black-box				NN as black-box			
	Black-box	Factual LIME	BELLA	Counterfactual BELLA	Black-box	Factual LIME	BELLA	Counterfactual BELLA
Auto MPG	3.44	2.10	1.88	4.89	2.30	2.66	1.08	5.13
Bike	197.33	421.50	245.30	485.41	235.21	520.18	228.44	566.31
Concrete	4.09	7.79	4.84	3.22	4.75	14.17	4.68	2.41
Servo	0.43	0.61	0.66	1.00	0.34	1.22	1.05	1.07
Electrical	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.001	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.04
Superconductivity	9.24	31.34	11.85	46.11	11.44	46.25	6.42	72.45
White Wine Quality	0.62	0.41	0.37	0.57	0.70	0.46	0.25	1.09
Real estate valuation	7.13	5.59	4.15	12.32	7.91	6.84	1.87	11.28
Wind	3.12	1.86	1.30	5.17	3.07	4.73	1.87	5.34
CPU activity	3.14	18.86	3.72	1.22	2.97	30.86	1.88	6.06
Echocardiogram	10.97	4.24	4.06	15.02	12.18	10.98	3.89	15.77
Iranian Churn	17.39	214.10	23.91	91.12	3.27	242.25	19.29	129.89

Here, n is the number of features, and the β_i are the regression coefficients of the explanations. The explanation distance is in the range of $[0, 1]$, and two explanations are the same iff their distance is equal to 0. The smaller the distance between the explanations, the higher the robustness. Therefore we define robustness as $1 - \textit{Explanation distance}$ so that higher values represent better robustness. We compute explanations for each data point in the test set, and compute robustness wrt. the 10 closest data points for each of them. The results are shown in Table 6. LIME samples 5000 data points to create a synthetic neighborhood. Thus, LIME can perform slightly better than our approach on datasets that have fewer observations. Still, in the majority of cases, and on average, BELLA outperforms LIME. BELLA also outperforms SHAP by a wide margin. This is because SHAP’s explanations are tailored for a single data point, while BELLA provides explanations that apply to a larger neighborhood.

We thus see that BELLA outperforms LIME and SHAP on simplicity, generality, and robustness, and LIME additionally on fidelity. This is because the surrogate models of BELLA are explicitly designed for these criteria.

Counterfactuality for a given reference value can be measured as the fidelity of an explanation wrt. the reference value. For each data point x with its target value y , we set the reference values to $y_{ref} = y \pm 0.3 \times |y_{max} - y_{min}|$. Table 7 shows the RMSE of the counterfactual explanations (as well as the RMSE of the black-box model wrt. the testing data, the factual explanations by BELLA, and the factual explanations by LIME for comparison). We see that the counterfactual explanations of BELLA are often of similar fidelity as its factual explanations. Even in the cases where the error of counterfactual explanations is an order of magnitude larger, it is still lower or comparable to the error of the factual-only explanations provided by LIME.

4.2 User study

To evaluate which explanations are preferred by users and which properties they find important, we conducted a user study. We used the `Connect` platform⁴. The participants were selected so that they have high acceptance rate of responses on the platform ($> 90\%$), at least a bachelor’s degree,

4. <https://connect.cloudresearch.com/>

Table 8: User Study results

		Fidelity	Generality	Simplicity	Verifiability
Is important to me (%)		98.67	91.33	98.00	74.00
Method	Rating	Positive votes (%)			
LIME	2.96 ± 0.297	54.00	38.00	60.00	36.00
SHAP	3.08 ± 0.299	88.00	28.00	48.00	36.00
BELLA	3.64 ± 0.222	84.00	64.00	66.00	94.00

and knowledge of the English language. We used the Iranian Churn Dataset (Jafari-Marandi et al., 2020), and trained a random forest with 1000 trees as black box model. Then, we trained three interpretable models: SHAP, LIME, and BELLA. As before, for each data point, we set the size of the explanation for LIME to the size of explanation provided by BELLA. Each participant of the user study was presented with one data point from the test set, the prediction by the black-box model, and the explanations provided by each of the three approaches. Each explanation consisted of a waterfall chart and a textual description of how to interpret the diagram. We also show to how many other data points the explanation applies. For each explanation, we asked the participants to evaluate how satisfactory it was, using a scale from 1 (least satisfactory) to 5 (most satisfactory). Then, we asked them to say whether the fidelity of the explanation was (1) sufficient, (2) insufficient or (3) not important for the participant. We did the same for generality and simplicity. For verifiability (i.e., the possibility to compute the explained value from the feature values), we asked whether the criterion was important or not.

To ensure the quality of the data, we eliminated users with incoherent responses. For example, since SHAP is always more accurate than LIME and BELLA, users who mark the fidelity of BELLA as acceptable, but the fidelity of SHAP as unacceptable must be incoherent. We obtained valid answers from 50 users, i.e., answers for 50 data points in total, each with a judgement for LIME, for BELLA, and for SHAP. Table 8 shows the average rating of each system (with confidence intervals at $\alpha = 95\%$). We also show the overall percentage of explanations where fidelity, generality, simplicity, and verifiability were considered important (i.e., where the participant did not choose the answer “not important”). For each system, we show the percentage of explanations where the participants rated the fidelity sufficient (as opposed to insufficient), and similarly for the other criteria. SHAP and LIME do not provide verifiable explanations, and thus the table shows the percentage of users who considered this criterion irrelevant in the explanations provided by these systems. For BELLA, the value is the percentage of users who considered the verifiable explanations important.

Overall, fidelity is considered the most important criterion, which is in line with previous studies (Radulovic et al., 2021). Since SHAP’s explanations are tuned for fidelity, SHAP scores highest on this desideratum, as expected. However, SHAP falls behind on the other important criterion, simplicity. This is because SHAP uses all features, and thus delivers explanations that are considered too complex. BELLA and LIME use the same number of features, and thus both score better on this criterion. The third most important criterion is generality, but SHAP and LIME do not optimize for this criterion. Hence BELLA comes first in the user ratings on this criterion. The verifiable explanations are considered important by 74% of the users. Since only BELLA provides an interpretable rule for calculating the explained value, our approach is rated highest. All of this entails that, on average, BELLA’s explanations are rated better than the explanations of the competitors, by a sig-

nificant margin. We ran a paired T-test to compare the users’ ratings of the three methods. There was a significant difference between ratings of BELLA and those of LIME, $t = -3.46$, $p = .001$, and SHAP, $t = -2.92$, $p = .005$. We take this as an indication that explanations should optimize not just fidelity, but also simplicity, generality, and verifiability. Indeed, the most general local explanation that BELLA itself gives for the user ratings is $rating = 0.38 \times fidelity + 0.37 \times generality + 0.11 \times simplicity$. It applies to 135 system ratings.

4.3 Verification on an interpretable model

To confirm that the explanations provided by BELLA represent what the black-box model has learned, we evaluate them with regard to an already interpretable model. Instead of a black-box model, we train an Ordinary Least Square linear regression model and consider the 5 most important features. We then compute the explanations for each data point in the test set with our method. BELLA was able to recover on average 85.12% of the original top-5 features across all datasets from the ones in Table 2. This shows that our method provides explanations that generally agree with prior beliefs, as encoded in an interpretable model.

5. Conclusion and Future Work

We have presented BELLA, an approach to provide post-hoc local explanations for any regression black-box model, or indeed any static tabular dataset with a numeric variable to be explained. BELLA is the first deterministic method of its kind and it can provide both factual and counterfactual explanations. The local linear approximations are computed by optimizing an objective function that ensures accurate, general, and simple explanations. We showed through detailed experiments that BELLA outperforms state-of-the-art approaches on these desiderata, often by a wide margin. Our user study shows the importance of the possibility to compute the explained value directly from the feature values, which only BELLA allows.

This work can be continued along several lines. In many applications, human intervention could lead to more plausible explanations. For example, our counterfactual explanations could be improved if users specified which features can be modified. One can also investigate if density-based clustering algorithms can be used for computing the neighborhoods. Finally, a common challenge for all distance-based machine learning algorithms is the search for more efficient ways to compute neighborhoods. We hope that our work can open the door to research along these avenues and others in the pursuit of making the predictions of machine learning models more interpretable.

References

- Adadi, A., & Berrada, M. (2018). Peeking inside the black-box: A survey on explainable artificial intelligence (xai). *Access*, 6.
- Ahmad, A., & Dey, L. (2007). A k-mean clustering algorithm for mixed numeric and categorical data. *Data & Knowledge Engineering*, 63(2), 503–527.
- Alvarez-Melis, D., & Jaakkola, T. S. (2018). On the robustness of interpretability methods. *arXiv preprint, arXiv:1806.08049*.
- Austin, P. C., & Steyerberg, E. W. (2015). The number of subjects per variable required in linear regression analyses. *Journal of clinical epidemiology*, 68(6), 627–636.

- Bastani, O., Kim, C., & Bastani, H. (2017). Interpreting blackbox models via model extraction. *arXiv preprint, arXiv:1705.08504*.
- Beaudouin, V., Bloch, I., Bounie, D., Cl  men  on, S., d’Alch   Buc, F., Eagan, J., Maxwell, W., Mozharovskiy, P., & Parekh, J. (2020). Flexible and context-specific ai explainability: a multidisciplinary approach. *SSRN, 3559477*.
- Berry, K. J., & Mielke Jr, P. W. (1988). A generalization of cohen’s kappa agreement measure to interval measurement and multiple raters. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 48*(4), 921–933.
- Boz, O. (2002). Extracting decision trees from trained neural networks. In *SIGKDD*.
- Breiman, L., Friedman, J., Stone, C. J., & Olshen, R. A. (1984). *Classification and regression trees*. CRC press.
- Burkart, N., & Huber, M. F. (2021). A survey on the explainability of supervised machine learning. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research, 70*, 245–317.
- Cand  s, E. J., & Plan, Y. (2009). Near-ideal model selection by l_1 minimization. *The Annals of Statistics, 37*(5A), 2145–2177.
- Cohen, J. (1960). A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. *Educational and psychological measurement, 20*(1), 37–46.
- Craven, M., & Shavlik, J. W. (1996). Extracting tree-structured representations of trained networks. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*.
- Dandl, S., Molnar, C., Binder, M., & Bischl, B. (2020). Multi-objective counterfactual explanations. In *International Conference on Parallel Problem Solving from Nature*, pp. 448–469. Springer.
- Das, A., & Rad, P. (2020). Opportunities and challenges in explainable artificial intelligence (xai): A survey. *arXiv preprint, arXiv:2006.11371*.
- Dua, D., & Graff, C. (2017). UCI machine learning repository..
- European Commission (2021). Proposal for a regulation laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (artificial intelligence act)..
- Goodman, B., & Flaxman, S. (2017). European union regulations on algorithmic decision-making and a “right to explanation”. *AI magazine, 38*(3).
- Guidotti, R., Monreale, A., Ruggieri, S., Pedreschi, D., Turini, F., & Giannotti, F. (2018a). Local rule-based explanations of black box decision systems. *arXiv preprint, arXiv:1805.10820*.
- Guidotti, R., Monreale, A., Ruggieri, S., Turini, F., Giannotti, F., & Pedreschi, D. (2018b). A survey of methods for explaining black box models. *ACM computing surveys, 51*(5).
- Harikumar, S., & Surya, P. (2015). K-medoid clustering for heterogeneous datasets. *Procedia Computer Science, 70*, 226–237.
- Hastie, T., Tibshirani, R., Friedman, J. H., & Friedman, J. H. (2009). *The elements of statistical learning: data mining, inference, and prediction*, Vol. 2. Springer.
- Hopcroft, J., & Kannan, R. (2014). *Foundations of data science*. Cambridge University Press;.
- Ignatiev, A., Narodytska, N., & Marques-Silva, J. (2019). Abduction-based explanations for machine learning models. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 33-01, pp. 1511–1519.

- Jafari-Marandi, R., Denton, J., Idris, A., Smith, B. K., & Keramati, A. (2020). Optimum profit-driven churn decision making: innovative artificial neural networks in telecom industry. *Neural Computing and Applications*, 32, 14929–14962.
- Janson, H., & Olsson, U. (2001). A measure of agreement for interval or nominal multivariate observations. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 61(2), 277–289.
- Janson, H., & Olsson, U. (2004). A measure of agreement for interval or nominal multivariate observations by different sets of judges. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 64(1), 62–70.
- Johansson, U., & Niklasson, L. (2009). Evolving decision trees using oracle guides. In *Symp. on Computational Intelligence and Data Mining*.
- Lakkaraju, H., Bach, S. H., & Leskovec, J. (2016). Interpretable decision sets: A joint framework for description and prediction. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery and data mining*, pp. 1675–1684.
- Lundberg, S. M., & Lee, S.-I. (2017). A unified approach to interpreting model predictions. In *NEURIPS*.
- Meinshausen, N. (2007). Relaxed lasso. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 52(1), 374–393.
- Miller, T. (2018). Contrastive explanation: A structural-model approach. *arXiv preprint, arXiv:1811.03163*.
- Miller, T. (2019). Explanation in artificial intelligence: Insights from the social sciences. *Artificial intelligence*, 267, 1–38.
- Molnar, C. (2018). A guide for making black box models explainable. URL: <https://christophm.github.io/interpretable-ml-book>, 2, 3.
- Murdoch, W. J., Singh, C., Kumbier, K., Abbasi-Asl, R., & Yu, B. (2019). Interpretable machine learning: definitions, methods, and applications. *arXiv preprint, arXiv:1901.04592*.
- Parekh, J., Mozharovskiy, P., & d’Alché Buc, F. (2021). A framework to learn with interpretation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34.
- Pedregosa, F., Varoquaux, G., Gramfort, et al. (2011). Scikit-learn: Machine learning in Python. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 12.
- Radulovic, N., Bifet, A., & Suchanek, F. (2021). Confident interpretations of black box classifiers. In *2021 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)*, pp. 1–8. IEEE.
- Ribeiro, M. T., Singh, S., & Guestrin, C. (2016). Why should i trust you? – explaining the predictions of any classifier. In *SIGKDD*.
- Ribeiro, M. T., Singh, S., & Guestrin, C. (2018). Anchors: High-precision model-agnostic explanations. In *AAAI*.
- Romano, J. D., Le, T. T., La Cava, W., Gregg, J. T., Goldberg, D. J., Chakraborty, P., Ray, N. L., Himmelstein, D., Fu, W., & Moore, J. H. (2021). Pmlb v1.0: an open source dataset collection for benchmarking machine learning methods. *arXiv preprint, arXiv:2012.00058v2*.
- Rudin, C. (2018). Please stop explaining black box models for high stakes decisions. *Stat*, 1050, 26.

- Slack, D., Hilgard, S., Jia, E., Singh, S., & Lakkaraju, H. (2020). Fooling lime and shap: Adversarial attacks on post hoc explanation methods. In *Proceedings of the AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*, pp. 180–186.
- Stine, R. A. (1995). Graphical interpretation of variance inflation factors. *The American Statistician*, 49(1), 53–56.
- Torgo, L., & Gama, J. (1996). Regression by classification. In *Brazilian symposium on artificial intelligence*, pp. 51–60. Springer.
- Wachter, S., Mittelstadt, B., & Russell, C. (2017). Counterfactual explanations without opening the black box: Automated decisions and the gdpr. *Harv. JL & Tech.*, 31, 841.
- White, A., & Garcez, A. d. (2019). Measurable counterfactual local explanations for any classifier. *arXiv preprint, arXiv:1908.03020*.
- Zafar, M. R., & Khan, N. M. (2019). Dlime: A deterministic local interpretable model-agnostic explanations approach for computer-aided diagnosis systems. *arXiv preprint, arXiv:1906.10263*.
- Zhang, Y., Song, K., Sun, Y., Tan, S., & Udell, M. (2019). ” why should you trust my explanation?” understanding uncertainty in lime explanations. *arXiv preprint, arXiv:1904.12991*.

⋮

1