

From Model Explanation to Data Misinterpretation: Uncovering the Pitfalls of Post Hoc Explainers in Business Research

Ronilo Ragodos* Tong Wang † Lu Feng ‡ Jeffrey Hu §

September 2, 2024

Abstract

Machine learning models have been increasingly used in business research. However, most state-of-the-art machine learning models, such as deep neural networks and XG-Boost, are black boxes in nature. Therefore, post hoc explainers that provide explanations for machine learning models by, for example, estimating numerical importance of the input features, have been gaining wide usage. Despite the intended use of post hoc explainers being explaining machine learning *models*, we found a growing trend in business research where post hoc explanations are used to draw inferences about the *data*. In this work, we investigate the validity of such use. Specifically, we investigate with extensive experiments *whether* the explanations obtained by the two most popular post hoc explainers, SHAP and LIME, provide correct information about the true marginal effects of X on Y in the data, which we call data-alignment. We then identify *what* factors influence the alignment of explanations. Finally, we propose a set of mitigation strategies to improve the data-alignment of explanations and demonstrate their effectiveness with real-world data in an econometric context. In spite of this effort, we nevertheless conclude that it is often not appropriate to infer data insights from post hoc explanations. We articulate appropriate alternative uses, the most important of which is to facilitate the proposition and subsequent empirical investigation of hypotheses. The ultimate goal of this paper is to caution business researchers *against* translating post hoc explanations of machine learning *models* into potentially false insights and understanding of *data*.

Keywords: XAI, XML, post-hoc explainers

*University of Iowa

†Yale University

‡University of Electronic Science and Technology of China

§Purdue University

1 Introduction

Over the past few decades, the surge in data volume and complexity has led to the widespread adoption of machine learning (ML) for business analysis (Kleinberg et al. 2015, Mullainathan and Spiess 2017). ML is commonly used in scenarios where researchers focus on predicting a particular variable of interest. This translates into formulating a supervised learning problem where the target variable is predicted by an ML model using explanatory variables (features) as inputs.

However, in business research, prediction alone is often insufficient. Researchers and practitioners are also interested in gaining insights about their data through ML models. In particular, they seek information about how explanatory variables are associated with the target variable, a relationship that can be described by the marginal effects of the explanatory variables.¹ Unfortunately, most ML models with high accuracy operate as black boxes² that produce predictions without providing any information about the explanatory variables. Thus, researchers often cannot obtain data insights directly from their predictive models.

In response to the opacity of black box models, post hoc explainers have naturally garnered significant attention from business researchers. Explainers provide various types of explanations of black box models, such as feature importance (Ribeiro et al. 2016, Lundberg and Lee 2017), partial dependence plots (Friedman 2001), counterfactual examples (Mothilal et al. 2020), etc. Many recent works in business research follow what we call the Explanation Pipeline, shown in Figure 1, in which a black box ML model is employed for a complicated prediction task and subsequently explained by a post hoc explainer. This pipeline enables researchers to gain some understanding of the model’s decision-making process, such as the importance of different features.

Although post hoc explanations are intended to explain ML models, a growing number of research papers seem to rely on the expectation that such explanations can be extrapolated to understand the data rather than the model. This expectation is particularly pertinent for explainers that produce feature importance, such as Local Interpretable Model-Agnostic Explanations (LIME) (Ribeiro et al. 2016) and Shapley Additive Explanations (SHAP) (Lundberg and Lee 2017). Indeed, recent literature increasingly adopts this problematic perspective. SHAP and LIME explanations of black box models have been extrapolated in diverse areas of business literature to make inferences about the marginal effects of the features. For instance, Park and Kim (2024) claims that SHAP explanations provide guidance on what smartphone features customers prefer. Jiang et al. (2024) says that if a customer has a large value for a feature with large SHAP values, they are more likely to be churners, and Sánchez-Franco and Rey-Tienda (2023) claims that their SHAP explanations reveal what factors actually drive hotel guest satisfaction and so hotel managers should plan their service strategies accordingly. Some recent work is quite optimistic about post hoc explanations - Berger (2023) advocates the use of the combination of an ML model and SHAP as

¹Note that marginal effects are descriptive and do not directly indicate causality unless certain key assumptions, such as exogeneity, no omitted variable bias, etc., hold.

²It is worth acknowledging that recent years have seen the emergence of inherently interpretable models that can attain comparable performance to black box models, sans the reliance on post hoc explanations. However, these models, which lie beyond the purview of this paper’s discussion, will not be further delved into here.




Figure 1: Explanation Pipeline: the pipeline of using post hoc explainers to explain a machine learning model. Additionally inferring information about the actual marginal effects of the features constitutes mistaken usage of the pipeline.

an “alternative to OLS.”

To gain a deeper understanding of the prevalent practice of employing post hoc explanations in business research, we conducted a thorough review of the literature. Specifically, we surveyed more than 700 papers from the business literature published between 2018 and 2024 that cited SHAP or LIME³ and manually identify 150 that actually used SHAP or LIME to obtain post hoc explanations. 109 of them have been published in top journals.⁴ The remaining 41 papers include papers from SSRN that have yet to complete the long review process of business journals. We have meticulously analyzed these 150 papers and found that among them, 42% used the post hoc explanations to draw inferences about the *data*, rather than the *ML model* being explained. Their conclusions and putative insights can be roughly categorized into three dominant types. First, papers make claims about the qualitative relationships between X and Y , most commonly about whether an X has a positive or negative relationship with Y . They use language like “ X_j has a positive/negative impact on Y ,” when the explainer provides a positive/negative feature importance for feature X_j . Second, papers infer the relative importance of the features from post hoc explanations. They use language like “ X_1 is more important to Y than X_2 is” if the feature importance of X_1 is larger than that of X_2 . Finally, some papers would use post hoc explanations to identify the most influential features and use language like “ X_{j_1} , X_{j_2} , and X_{j_3} are the most important to Y ” when the feature importance for X_{j_1} , X_{j_2} , and X_{j_3} are greater in magnitude than the others. All these claims aim to describe or partially describe the marginal effect of X on Y in the data. Such use of explainers suggests an emerging paradigm shift in which, through post hoc explanations, ML models are used not only for prediction but also as a means to gain understanding of data. However, the validity of using explainers for this purpose remains unjustified.

Therefore, the goal of this paper is to conduct a thorough investigation into this new

³LIME was published in 2016, and SHAP was published in 2017. Considering the time it takes to write a business paper, we set the start time of our literature search to 2018 for papers that use either LIME or SHAP.

⁴We consider a journal a top journal if the 5-year impact factor is above 5 or the journal is an INFORMS journal. Note that SHAP and LIME are relatively new methods, and the business journal review processes are long. Therefore, many of the remaining papers are still under review and are not counted among the 109 top journal papers we reviewed.

and emerging trend of research methodology. We aim to directly answer the question, “*Can SHAP and LIME explanations capture the correct relationship between X and Y , specifically the marginal effect of X on Y , in the data?*” with both empirical and theoretical evidence. Specifically, we investigate whether the SHAP and LIME explanations align with the true marginal effects in the data within three contexts that they are often used, as described previously. For this purpose, we design three *new* metrics that assess post hoc explanations in terms of capturing correct information about the true marginal effects. The first metric evaluates whether an explanation’s feature importance values have the same signs as the corresponding marginal effects. We call it the **directionality** of an explanation, since it represents how well an explanation identifies the directions in which features influence the target. The second metric evaluates how much the ranking of features by a post hoc explanation agrees with the ranking induced by the marginal effects. We call it the **concordance** of an explanation. The last metric evaluates whether a post hoc explanation identifies the most important features. We call it the **relevance** of the explanation. These metrics assess the extent to which the explanations are consistent with the marginal effects in terms of the sign, the ranking of features, and the identification of the most important features. We call the evaluation of these three metrics the test of **data-alignment**.

We evaluate the data-alignment of post hoc explanations using simulated data where we know and can control the ground truth marginal effects in the data. We set our ground truth models to be linear because the extent an explainer can produce data-aligned explanations of simple linear models is indicative of its potential for data-alignment in more general scenarios – if an explainer cannot give data-aligned explanations of simple linear phenomena, it is very likely unable to be able to explain the complex processes underlying practical datasets. Unfortunately, our findings reveal that SHAP and LIME explanations typically *do not align* with the marginal effects, not even qualitatively (directionality), and the alignment further drops as the feature dimension increases. This misalignment is evident even in straightforward business scenarios with a linear ground truth model and when the black box model being explained demonstrates high predictive performance on data containing all relevant features to Y , all of which are mutually independent.

We then delve into the causes of this misalignment, discovering that various factors within the explanation pipeline affect explanation quality. These include having correlated features in the data, the predictive performance of the black box model, and specific settings of explainer model parameters. Critically, we offer a theoretical justification for why SHAP explanations inherently fail to align with the marginal effects, making Shapley values fundamentally inappropriate for any definite claims regarding marginal effects. We show that SHAP estimates situational importance (Štrumbelj and Kononenko 2014), which expresses the consequence of a feature taking on a value different from its mean. Although the computation of situational importance for a feature involves its marginal effect, the information it contributes can be destroyed in the process. Furthermore, we present theoretical grounds for conditions under which LIME might achieve a high degree of data-alignment.

Finally, we explore potential strategies to increase the data-alignment of explanations provided by SHAP and LIME. Although our theoretical and empirical findings suggest that it is not possible to fully eliminate the issue of data-misalignment, they nevertheless reveal opportunities for improvement, which we address. For instance, for SHAP, the most immediate way to increase data-alignment is to divide its Shapley values by the differences

between the corresponding feature values and their means; for LIME, increasing some hyperparameters will significantly increase the alignment with the data. Another strategy that showed promise involves averaging the explanations derived from a family of accurate models. We also observe that when the training data used by a black box model include all relevant features, all of which are independent, the alignment of explanations of the black box’s predictions with the ground truth tends to increase. This suggests that the underlying data quality and structure play a significant role in the effectiveness of post hoc explanations. However, other intuitive strategies we tested, such as combining explanations from both SHAP and LIME for a single black box model, did not yield effective results. This highlights the complexity of the issue and the need for more nuanced solutions. It is also important to note that while our proposed mitigation strategies improve data-alignment to various degrees, they do not completely resolve the issue of misalignment inherent in SHAP and LIME. Consequently, post hoc explainers such as SHAP and LIME should be used with great caution by business researchers, and the appropriate uses of such tools need to be clarified.

Overall, our paper identifies and cautions against a growing trend of the inappropriate use of post hoc explanations to draw inferences about data, leading to data misinterpretation. We argue that post hoc explanations should not be used to **validate** hypotheses about data; instead, their role in gathering knowledge about data should be limited to **proposal** of hypotheses. To gain an accurate understanding of the underlying relationships the data, we emphasize the need for more rigorous and comprehensive follow-up analyses, both quantitatively and qualitatively. This distinction is essential to ensure the prevention of the overestimation of the reliability and validity of insights derived from post hoc explainers in business research.

The paper is organized as follows. We will review related work pertaining to SHAP, LIME, and their weaknesses in Section 2. Section 3 focuses on the use of SHAP and LIME in business literature, showing the prevalence of inappropriate usage. Then we use a simulated dataset with ground-truth models that we created to demonstrate the Explanation Pipeline and its vulnerabilities in Section 4. We provide theoretical and empirical analyses on why post hoc explanations are not suitable to infer information about marginal effects in Section 5. We then showcase some mitigation strategies for SHAP and LIME in Section 6 and subsequently gauge how beneficial they are over baselines in reproducing the findings of an econometric study carried out using real loan application data in Section 6.5. The paper concludes in Section 7 with a summary of our findings and final remarks on post hoc explanations and their appropriate use in business research. In the appendix, we provide additional details about our experimental designs and corroborate results of Section 5.3 by repeating the experiment on another dataset.

2 Related Work

This section introduces SHAP and LIME and then reviews the prior literature that discusses their weaknesses from perspectives different from our paper.

2.1 Post Hoc Explainers - SHAP and LIME

SHAP (Lundberg and Lee 2017) and LIME (Ribeiro et al. 2016) are the two most widely used model-agnostic post hoc explainers. We use SHAP and LIME as representatives for post hoc explainers in this paper because they are also the dominant choices for post hoc explainers in business research.

SHAP (SHapley Additive exPlanations) is a groundbreaking approach in the field of interpretable machine learning that offers a unified measure of feature importance. Developed by Lundberg and Lee in 2017, it builds on the concepts of game theory, particularly the Shapley value, to assign an importance value to each feature for a particular prediction. The fundamental idea behind SHAP is to assess the contribution of each feature to the difference between the actual prediction and the average prediction over the dataset. One of the unique aspects of SHAP is its consistency and local accuracy. The method guarantees that if a model changes in a way that makes a feature more important, the SHAP value of that feature will not decrease. Local accuracy ensures that the contributions of all features sum up to the actual prediction minus the average prediction, providing a detailed and accurate decomposition of the prediction. Note that LIME does not have this local accuracy property. There are several variants of SHAP, such as Kernel SHAP (Lundberg and Lee 2017), TreeSHAP (Lundberg et al. 2018) and DeepSHAP (Lundberg and Lee 2017). Each variant retains the core principles of SHAP while adjusting the computational strategy to suit the specific model architecture, ensuring that the interpretability benefits of SHAP can be realized across a wide range of machine learning models.

Although not used as widely as SHAP in business research, LIME is the very first model-agnostic post hoc explainer. It was developed by Ribeiro et al. (2016). LIME trains a ridge regressor on a synthetic dataset constructed by sampling uniformly around the input datum. The coefficients of the ridge regressors indicate the importance of each feature. LIME discretizes numerical features into quartiles to avoid dealing with problems associated with differing scales of features and ensure users do not get confused when interpreting negative weights for negative valued features. The ridge regression’s optimization weighs the sampled data with an exponential kernel and includes an L_1 (LASSO) penalty. LIME uses the L_1 regularization so that the regressor it produces is sparse in the sense that, rather than including all features, only a subset of features that are most influential for predictions near the instance being explained are included. This makes LIME’s explanations more concise than they would be otherwise. The ridge regressors are called surrogate models because they are trained to approximate the predictions of the black box model.

LIME’s ridge coefficients are meant to represent marginal effects, but depending on the LIME variant and the model being explained, they are not the gradient of the black box model at the input being explained. Garreau and von Luxburg (2020) proved that the original LIME formulation’s coefficients did not, in general, equal the gradient of the black box model at the input being explained. Instead, each feature importance value is proportional to the partial derivative of the black box at the input datum and the proportionality constants differ by feature. Agarwal et al. (2021) showed that a simpler variant of LIME called C-LIME that does not discretize input features and does not perform weighted ridge regression produced coefficients that are proportional to the gradient of the black box model. In discretizing features, the data used in LIME’s regression problem consists of binary features indicating

which bins (quantiles) the feature values of sampled data fall into, which destroys the gradient since the local information about the black box’s decision boundary is lost. Moreover, C-LIME drops the ridge penalty because enforcing sparsity opposes the goal of recovering the gradient. In the specific case where the model being explained is linear, C-LIME recovers the coefficients of the linear model. This being the case, in this paper, we choose to disable the discretization setting of LIME throughout the paper to improve the quality of LIME explanations.

2.2 The Evaluation of Post hoc Explanations

The alarm for post hoc explanations had first gone off in the field of machine learning, as researchers questioned the correctness and validity of post hoc explanations. However, the notions of correctness and validity in the ML literature differ from the point of view we take in this paper. The ML community’s attention has mainly focused on explanation quality **with respect to the ML model** since the primary goal of the machine learning field is to develop new models that make better or faster predictions. In addition, they consider factors relating the ability of humans to interpret the explanations, most of which do not fall within the scope of our critique. Thus, the way the ML community evaluates explainers is different from how we evaluate them in this paper.

That post hoc explainers misrepresent the black boxes they explain is a pillar of the ML community’s critique. The terms *fidelity* and *faithfulness* are used interchangeably and generally represent the maxims of completeness and soundness outlined by Zhou et al. (2021). An explanation is complete if it is a full characterization of the black box’s behavior. An explanation is sound if its characterization is correct.⁵ Garreau and von Luxburg (2020) and Han et al. (2022) consider soundness from a function approximation perspective, directly measuring the difference between an explainer and the black box model. Garreau and von Luxburg (2020) shows that LIME’s approximation error is always bounded away from 0. Han et al. (2022) analyzes kernelSHAP and LIME relying on a view of KernelSHAP and LIME as kernel weighted linear regression models whose input data are sampled by perturbing the input by random noise. They remark that the choice of noise distribution made by kernelSHAP and LIME prevents them from being able to recover the gradient of linear models they explain as feature importance values. It follows that KernelSHAP and LIME cannot necessarily be expected to reliably perform their intended task of interpreting black box model behaviors. Other fidelity/faithfulness metrics measure particular approximation properties such as the extent to which an explainer assigns zero importance to features the model does not depend on are used as metrics in Nguyen and Rodríguez Martínez (2020). Metrics such as Deletion and Insertion metrics are based on the idea that features said to be important by an explainer should have significant effects on black box output (DeYoung et al. 2020, Nguyen and Rodríguez Martínez 2020, Alvarez-Melis and Jaakkola 2018, Luss et al. 2021). However, all previously mentioned papers study the fidelity with respect to the *ML model*, rather than the data, as we do in this paper. Nevertheless, the aforementioned studies partially answer our research question – if a black box explainer has difficulty even

⁵In this paper, however, we characterize faithfulness in reference to the ground truth instead of the black box model because we are interested in obtaining insights about reality, not about black box models. In Section 5.1, we define metrics that capture our notion of faithfulness.

being faithful to an ML model, it would be even more challenging for it to provide correct data insights.

The ML community has also largely focused on other aspects of post hoc explanations, such as interpretability or understandability of the explanations. Explainers which satisfy desiderata related to interpretability should be able to provide a description of the behavior of a black box model in a form which can be easily understood by humans. For example, explanations should be simple enough to be intelligible but complex enough so that the explanation is still complete and sound. Parsimony (Nguyen and Rodríguez Martínez 2020) and clarity (Lakkaraju et al. 2017, Montavon et al. 2018, Alvarez-Melis and Jaakkola 2018) metrics, for example, measure the simplicity and ambiguity of explanations, respectively⁶. Jacovi et al. (2023) further requires that the form of explanations match what the psychology literature identifies as natural for human understanding. Simplicity of explanations beyond the per-feature importance values given by attributive explainers is not desirable in our application because, e.g. artificial enforcement of sparsity could encourage explanations to omit information about the marginal effects and become incomplete and unsound as a result.

3 Use of SHAP and LIME in Business Research

As part of our literature review process, we cataloged papers at the intersection of business and explainable machine learning.

We searched for papers from three sources. First, we used Web of Science to search for publications citing at least one of LIME (Ribeiro et al. 2016) or SHAP (Lundberg and Lee 2017) and have either “LIME” or “SHAP” appear in the body of the paper. The results were filtered by topics related to business, such as management, economics, supply chain & logistics, operations research & management science, etc. More than 700 papers were identified. See Figure 2 for a breakdown of the number of papers by year. The second source




Figure 2: Year-by-year breakdown of number of papers citing either LIME or SHAP that belong to business-adjacent Web of Science categories.

⁶We use the terminology of Markus et al. (2021) here.

of papers is INFORMS journals. We searched with the same keywords on the INFORMS journal portal. Finally, we searched on SSRN for papers that are not published yet. Because business journal papers usually take a few years to get published, there are many preprints available on SSRN. The total number of papers from these three sources that matched our keywords was over 700.

We then iterated through the resulting papers one by one, collecting papers that actually used SHAP or LIME to explain a machine learning model (many papers only mentioned SHAP or LIME in the context of related work or future work) until we had a total of 150 different papers. Out of these papers, 91% used SHAP and 14% used LIME to generate explanations for their models, including 5% using both of them.

We took a close look at these papers and characterized their use of post hoc explanations by the following procedure. We first searched for evidence that it was understood that the intended use of SHAP and LIME is to explain model outputs (rather than the data). On those that fail this screening, we identified problematic language indicative of inappropriate use of post hoc explanations and recorded quotations of problematic sentences. Not all papers contained such language; in some papers it was clear or made explicit that authors used SHAP and LIME only within the scope of model explanation. Having identified any quotations which we deemed problematic, we then divided the papers into three categories: the *controversial* papers that clearly extrapolated explanations to glean information about the marginal effects, the *ambiguous* papers whose wording could suggest extrapolation, and the *proper* papers that only used explanations for model interpretation (the intended use).

We found that 42% of the papers are controversial - they clearly extrapolated explanations to gain insight into the marginal effects in the data. In addition to that, there is another 15% ambiguous papers that at least used unclear language such that readers could interpret their findings as being made about the marginal effects. This means that **more than half** of the papers we sampled had some problematic language. Further, 76% of the controversial papers were from top journals.⁷ We believe that this result is indicative of a rising trend of using SHAP or LIME to gain data insights.

The interpretation of SHAP and LIME feature importance values in the controversial papers fell into three categories: 1) identifying the directionality of impact of each feature (i.e., feature importance sign), 2) ranking features by relative importance, and 3) identifying a subset of the most important features. Table 1 below records prototypical ways in which authors expressed their desire to perform these tasks. In Section 5.1, we define metrics to characterize the ability of an explainer to perform these tasks. We call them directionality, concordance, and relevance, respectively.

4 Explanation Pipeline

In this section, we formulate an Explanation Pipeline based on the approaches commonly employed in the business literature to obtain explanations using post hoc explainers. We then use a simulated dataset to demonstrate how this pipeline is typically applied.

⁷A journal was considered a “top journal” if it is an INFORMS journal or its most recent 5-year impact factor according to Clarivate’s Journal Citation Reports (JCR) was at least 5.0 at the time of writing (June 2024).

Table 1: Correspondence Between Paper Language and Our Metrics. Statements appearing in angle braces $\langle \cdot \rangle$ are meant to make the statements more general. The X_j represent data features and Y represents the outcome of interest.

PURPOSE	EXAMPLES
Identifying How Features Impact the Target (Directionality)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “...Positive SHAP values indicate that the variable has a facilitative effect on $\langle Y \rangle$, while negative values indicate a suppressive effect...” • “...Individuals whose predictions received larger SHAP values for this feature are more likely to have $\langle Y = 1 \rangle$...” • “...Choosing features with positive mean SHAP are recommended options because they have positive effects on $\langle Y \rangle$...”
Ranking the Features by Relative Importance (Concordance)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “...This study provides insights for planning the design of $\langle X \rangle$ by assessing the relative importance and associated rankings of the $\langle X_j \rangle$ in predicting $\langle Y \rangle$...” • “...The use of Shapley values enables us to identify and rank relevant $\langle X_j \rangle$ for the investigated $\langle Y \rangle$...” • “...Our feature rankings and visualizations of impact patterns provide policy makers with evidence for strategies to improve $\langle Y \rangle$...”
Identifying the Most Important (Top-k) Features (Relevance)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “...That $\langle X_1, X_2, X_3 \rangle$ have the top-3 SHAP values and that their SHAP values are positive reveals that increasing $\langle X_1, X_2, X_3 \rangle$ would lead to larger $\langle Y \rangle$...” • “...We use SHAP explanations of an XGBoost Classifier to identify the key features which contributing to the risk $\langle Y \rangle$...” • “...By using XAI to identify the most important factors and indicators that contribute to $\langle Y \rangle$, their values and fluctuations can then be monitored over time...”
Other Usage	<p>(OLS Alternative) • “...The combination of a black box algorithm and SHAP provides similar economic insights as provided by pooled OLS...”</p> <p>(Theory Confirmation) • “...SHAP is used to interpret the quantitative associations found by XGBoost; our results provide empirical support for prior theoretical findings...”</p> <p>(Recourse Advocacy) • “...Since $\langle X_1, X_2, \text{ and } X_3 \rangle$ have high SHAP importance and substantial effects on $\langle Y \rangle$, $\langle X_1, X_2, \text{ and } X_3 \rangle$ should be given attention by policy makers to increase $\langle X_1, X_2, \text{ and } X_3 \rangle$...”</p>

An explanation pipeline consists of two stages. In the first stage, which we call the *prediction stage*, a machine learning model \mathcal{M} is trained on data \mathcal{D} . This stage addresses the prediction problem, with the resulting predictions being evaluated using various metrics such as accuracy, ROC, and others. Evaluations with respect to these metrics are often the primary results in many business papers that solve a prediction task. In the second stage, which we call the *explanation stage*, an explainer model (e.g., SHAP or LIME), denoted by \mathcal{E} , is applied to \mathcal{M} to generate explanations. We denote an explanation for feature X_j of \mathcal{E} 's prediction for the i^{th} data instance $\mathbf{x}^{(i)}$ as $e_{\mathcal{E}}(x_j^{(i)})$. This stage provides model interpretation through simple human understandable explanations such as feature importance.

We illustrate the Explanation Pipeline with a simulated loan approval dataset.⁸ Our simulation models the task of predicting whether an individual will be approved for a loan based on their demographic features and credit-related features. We define a model for generating the target variable so that the ground truth is known and controllable. We also define the ground truth model to be linear, such that the explanation task is relatively easier for the post hoc explainers. In the following, we will describe how we generate our data and then apply the pipeline to a sample dataset using SHAP for demonstration. For consistency, we will be using this dataset and its variant Section 5 as well.

4.1 Data Generation Process

Our data generation process simulates a process of deciding whether loan applications are approved in a real-world scenario. In it, applicants have a total of ten features: four demographic features and six credit-related features. Table 2 summarizes how each feature is generated. The credit score feature is generated based on a partial FICO credit scoring model (Ligons 2023) and is given by the following formula: Credit Score = $650 + (10 + 2.5 \cdot \text{Credit History}) + (70 - 15 \cdot \text{Inquiries}) + (35 - 4 \cdot \text{Delinquencies}) + (105 - 100 \cdot \text{Utilization})$. “Cosigner” is positively correlated with “Married” in that the probability of having a cosigner is given by $\sigma(2 \cdot \text{Married} + 1 + \epsilon)$ where $\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \frac{1}{2})$.

FEATURE	MEANING	FORMULA
Age	Applicant Age	Uniform(18,100)
Sex	Applicant Sex	Bernoulli(.5)
Married	Applicant Marital Status	Bernoulli(.5)
Income	Applicant Income	Normal(40,000, 30,000)
Inquiries	Number of credit inquiries	Uniform(0,6)
Cosigner	Indicator of presence of loan cosigner	Function of Married
Utilization	Proportion of total credit utilized	Uniform(0,1)
Delinquencies	Number of delinquent payments in last 2 years	Uniform(0,24)
Credit Score	Credit score based on FICO scoring	FICO credit scoring model (Ligons 2023)

Table 2: Description of features for simulated loan data.

⁸Real datasets are less suitable for the experiments in this paper because we require access to the ground truth in order to evaluate the faithfulness of the post hoc explanations. However, in Section 6.5, we will conduct a case study using a real loan application dataset and use the results of a published econometric study using that dataset as the ground truth.

We define a model \mathcal{G} for generating applicants’ labels, *approved*, or *rejected*, so that we have a ground truth model that we can use to evaluate the quality of explanations from the explainers. This ground truth model represents the underlying decision-making process that is never observed. We define \mathcal{G} as a linear model and then compose it with a logistic sigmoid function to generate the labels. The true marginal effects β are defined using \mathcal{G}^9 below; it is the ground truth we compare the feature importance values provided by SHAP and LIME against.

\mathcal{G} is defined as the following linear model taking standardized features as input.

$$\mathcal{G}(X) = 2.5 + .0005 \cdot \text{Age} - 0 \cdot \text{Sex} + .1 \cdot \text{Married} + .25 \cdot \text{Cosigner} + 1.5 \cdot \text{Credit History} + 3 \cdot \text{Income} - 1 \cdot \text{Utilization} - .75 \cdot \text{Delinquencies} - .5 \cdot \text{Inquiries} + 5 \cdot \text{Credit Score} + \epsilon, \quad (1)$$

where $\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \frac{1}{4})$ captures all the variation in the response variable that is not explained by the explanatory variables. Using the logistic sigmoid function $\sigma(\cdot)$, we assign $Y = 1$ (approved) for cases with $\sigma(\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{x})) \geq 0.5$, and $Y = 0$ (rejected) otherwise. The intercept term 2.5 is chosen so that at a baseline when feature values are zero (features are standardized, so the means of numerical features are zero), an applicant is most likely accepted. The remaining coefficients are chosen so that “Credit Score” is the most important feature, followed by “Credit Inquiries,” “Delinquencies,” “Income,” “Credit History,” “Married,” “Cosigner,” “Age” and finally “Sex.” These coefficients are motivated by the literature. The probability of being approved for a loan increases significantly with an applicant’s credit score and insignificantly with their age (Consumer Financial Protection Bureau 2022). The probability decreases significantly as applicants use higher proportions of their available credit and receive recent credit inquiries. The sex of a customer is not supposed to effect approval outcomes (Calcagnini et al. 2014). We then create a dataset \mathcal{D} with 5000 data points by sampling from the distributions of features to simulate applicant profiles (\mathbf{X}) and using \mathcal{G} to create the labels (Y). In the following, we apply the Explanation Pipeline to demonstrate how one obtains a post hoc explanation by explaining \mathcal{M} using \mathcal{E} .

4.2 Applying the Explanation Pipeline

The Explanation Pipeline consists of two stages, the *prediction stage* in which an ML model \mathcal{M} is built using \mathcal{D} , and the *explanation stage* in which outputs of \mathcal{M} are explained with an explainer \mathcal{E} .


To demonstrate the pipeline, we choose \mathcal{M} to be a neural network (NN) with 100 hidden layer nodes. We perform a standard 80-20 train-test split of the 5000 applicants. The accuracy of \mathcal{M} is 0.86 and the AUROC is 0.93 on the test set. We choose \mathcal{E} to be SHAP for demonstration purpose since SHAP is used much more often than LIME is. We demonstrate a SHAP explanation using one applicant that we will call John. John is a 61-year-old married male who makes approximately \$66,000/year, has a credit score of 761, 6 credit inquiries in the past 6 months, and utilizes 19% of his 28-month old line of credit. He also has a cosigner

⁹Note, however, that under our definition of marginal effects, the coefficients in \mathcal{G} can differ from β because the β_j for a feature which influences other features is defined to be the total derivative of the response with respect to that feature.

and no delinquent payments in the last two years. John’s application was accepted, that is, $Y = 1$. Since we design the data generation model \mathcal{G} , we know the ground truth marginal effect of each feature in obtaining John’s application outcome, following formula (1), shown in the left panel of Figure 3b. John’s feature values are shown in Figure 3a and shapley values returned by SHAP are visualized in Figure 3b. We denote them by $e_{\text{SHAP}}(x_j)$.

Feature	Value
Credit Score	761
Income	\$66,000
Credit History	28 months
Cosigner	Yes
Married	Yes
Age	61
Sex	Male
Inquiries	6
Delinquency	0
Utilization	19%

(a) John’s feature values



(b) Ground truth and SHAP explanation for John

Figure 3: John’s demographics along with a plot of the SHAP values obtained by explaining \mathcal{M} ’s prediction for John, compared against the ground truth from \mathcal{G} .

Following how post hoc explanations are interpreted in the literature, we now inspect the $e_{\text{SHAP}}(x_j)$ coefficients to try to infer some information about the marginal effect of each feature. First, we can use the sign of the coefficients to infer the directionality of the impact of features. For example, we may deduce that the negative SHAP coefficient of “Married” in Figure 3b implies that if an applicant is married, the likelihood of loan approval decreases. We could use this proposition to infer that being married has a negative relationship with loan approval in reality. Second, we can use SHAP coefficients to make inferences about the relative importance of features. For example, “Delinquency” has the largest positive impact, while “Married” has the largest negative impact. Finally, we can use the magnitudes of the features to identify the most influential features. In this case, “Delinquency,” “Credit History” and “Income” are the three most important features.

Unfortunately, the above model explanation leads to significant data misinterpretation – the explanation differs significantly from the true marginal effects in every way, not just in value, but even in sign and relative importance. For example, the most important feature (largest β_j) should be “Credit Score” but SHAP suggests “Delinquency” is the most important. In addition, being married should have a positive impact on getting a loan application approved, and yet SHAP implies that the impact is negative.

The demonstration of the *misalignment* of post hoc explainers motivates the main thrust of this paper. That is, we want to find out why post hoc explainers are misaligned, what resulting harm could be done to researchers using such explainers, and what mitigation strategies could be employed for recourse. The ensuing sections will explicate the risks associated with employing post hoc explanations to make inferences about marginal effects. We aim to provide a detailed theoretical foundation for their limitations and a thorough

critique backed by empirical evidence, revealing the dangers of this approach.

5 Misalignment of Post Hoc Explanations

In this section, we study the research problem in more depth. We first describe how we evaluate explanations in Section 5.1 and show the generality of the problem of misalignment in Section 5.2. Then, in Section 5.3, we identify properties of the data \mathcal{D} , the model \mathcal{M} , and the explainer \mathcal{E} used in a pipeline that lead to misaligned explanations and demonstrate how those individually affect the explanation.

5.1 New Metrics for Assessing Post hoc Explanations

Both SHAP and LIME provide a feature importance measurement for each feature j , which we denote by $e_{\mathcal{E}}(x_j^{(i)})$, where \mathcal{E} represents the explainer. Our goal is to investigate whether $e_{\mathcal{E}}(x_j^{(i)})$ can be used to provide correct information about the marginal effect of feature j . To this end, we propose three new metrics that capture different aspects of explanations, each motivated by practical use cases of explanations from the literature: sign, importance ranking, and relevance.

First, we give a more detailed definition of the true marginal effects β so that our estimand is clear. Our characterization of β captures both the correlative effect that each explanatory variable has on the response variable individually as well as any effects that one variable can have on the target through other variables that depend on it. This is accomplished by considering two cases in our definition. If a feature X_j depends on any other feature, we define β_j to be the total derivative $\frac{dY}{dX_j}$. Otherwise, we define $\beta_j = \frac{\partial Y}{\partial X_j}$. Therefore, for linear models, the marginal effects equal the model coefficients.

We design three metrics to evaluate data-alignment considering the practical use case of the explanations. Researchers using SHAP and LIME typically use the feature importance values in three main ways: 1) inspect the sign of the feature importance values to identify how the features impact the outcome they are interested in 2) identify the relative importance of features and 3) identify the most influential features.

Therefore, we define the first metric, termed **directionality**, to measure whether post hoc explainers can at least identify the correct *sign* of a feature’s influence on the outcome. It evaluates an explanation only qualitatively. We calculate directionality by determining the percentage of instances where the sign of $e_{\mathcal{E}}(x_j^{(i)})$ matches that of β_j for feature j across M instances in the test set.

$$\text{directionality}(\{e_{\mathcal{E}}(x_j^{(i)})\}_{i=1}^M, \beta_j) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M s_j(e_{\mathcal{E}}(x_j^{(i)}), \beta_j) \quad (2)$$

where

$$s_j(e_{\mathcal{E}}(x_j^{(i)}), \beta_j) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}^+}(\beta_j \cdot e_{\mathcal{E}}(x_j^{(i)})) & \text{if } |\beta_j| > \epsilon_1 \\ \mathbf{1}_{(0, \epsilon_2)}\left(\frac{|e_{\mathcal{E}}(x_j^{(i)})|}{\max_{j'} |e_{\mathcal{E}}(x_{j'}^{(i)})|}\right) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Here $\mathbf{1}_S(z)$ is an indicator function that returns 1 if z is in the set S and outputs 0 otherwise. $s_j(e_{\mathcal{E}}(x_j^{(i)}), \beta_j)$ is designed to facilitate a relaxed version of accuracy by checking if β_j and $e_{\mathcal{E}}(x_j^{(i)})$ have the same sign only when β_j is not very small, i.e., larger than some $\epsilon_1 > 0$ in magnitude. When β_j is small, s_j instead checks if $e_{\mathcal{E}}(x_j^{(i)})$ is small relative to the other $e_{\mathcal{E}}(x_{j'}^{(i)})$, where $j' \neq j$. In particular, the ratio of $|e_{\mathcal{E}}(x_j^{(i)})|$ and $\max_{j'} |e_{\mathcal{E}}(x_{j'}^{(i)})|$ should be small. We check this using a variable threshold ϵ_2 . In our experiments, we use $\epsilon_1 = 1e-2$ and $\epsilon_2 = 1e-2$. This definition uses a relaxed conception of accuracy because, for example, if a ground truth marginal effect is 0.001 and the explanation returns -0.001, we would consider the explanation to correct, even if the signs do not agree, because both correctly identify that the feature has a very small impact on Y relative to the most important feature.

The second metric, **concordance**, measures how accurately the explanations recover the *relative importance* of features compared to the ground truth ranking induced by β . Given the $e_{\mathcal{E}}(x_j^{(i)})$, we rank the features from least to most important and calculate the *Spearman Rank Correlation* (Spearman 1904) between this ranking and a ranking of the β_j . While the directionality metric is computed using the entire test set per feature, concordance is computed per instance using all features.

$$\text{concordance}(e_{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}), \beta) = 1 - \frac{6 \sum_{j=1}^D (\text{rank}(\beta_j) - \text{rank}(e_{\mathcal{E}}(x_j^{(i)})))^2}{D(D^2 - 1)}, \quad (3)$$

Above, D is the number of features and $\text{rank}(\beta_j)$ and $\text{rank}(e_{\mathcal{E}}(x_j^{(i)}))$ denote the rank of the j^{th} feature according to the coefficients of β and explanations $e_{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{x}^{(i)})$, respectively. If an explainer’s rankings are 100% correct, then this correlation should be 1. Any value less than 1 indicates an error in the rankings (which can lead users to misinterpret the importance of some features).

Third, motivated by the fact that researchers may only be interested in identifying a small set of features that have the highest impact, we define the third metric, **relevance**, based on the ranking of features. Our metric, denoted relevance_k , measures how many of the top k most important features according to \mathcal{E} are among the top k largest marginal effects, both in magnitude. Denote by $I_k^+(e_{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}))$ and $I_k^+(\beta)$ the set of feature indices among the top k most highly ranked according to $e_{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{x}^{(i)})$ and β , respectively. Then we define

$$\text{relevance}_k(e_{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}), \beta) = \frac{|I_k^+(\beta) \cap I_k^+(e_{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}))|}{k}. \quad (4)$$

Like the concordance metric, relevance_k is also computed at the instance level. In our experiments, we compute relevance_k for each k and plot the means and standard errors over M instances. $\text{relevance}_k(e_{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}), \beta)$ represents the recall for the identification of features among the top- k largest marginal effects according to \mathcal{E} .

We call the evaluation of the directionality, concordance, and relevance the evaluation of **data-alignment**. We evaluate the data-alignment for SHAP and LIME on $M = 100$ applicants randomly selected from the test set and report the results in Figure 4. We find that neither SHAP nor LIME achieves satisfying results on any of the three dimensions. Most notably, in spite of the fact that SHAP is strongly favored over LIME by researchers (91% vs 14% from the papers we surveyed), SHAP performs significantly worse than LIME




Figure 4: Illustration of the three aspects of data-alignment evaluation. For plot (c) each point in the line plot represents a mean relevance for a given k . The error bars represent the standard error. The total number of features is 10.

in all three dimensions. **SHAP cannot even identify the correct directionality of the features**, let alone the concordance and relevance. To have a better understanding of the data-alignment of SHAP, we also simulate a *random* explainer that randomly draws its feature importance values $e_{\text{random}}(x_j^{(i)})$ from a standard normal distribution for each j and i . We find that *SHAP explanations do not have better data-alignment than random explanations with respect to directionality and concordance*.

5.2 Pervasiveness of Data-Misalignment - a Large Scale Evaluation

So far, we have only used one simulated dataset to demonstrate the misalignment of SHAP and LIME explanations. To study how pervasive the issue is, we evaluate the SHAP and LIME explanations using 100 simulated datasets.

Our 100 synthetic datasets have randomly selected numbers of features between 3 and 100, and randomly selected numbers of rows between 100 and 10000. The features are i.i.d. according to $\mathcal{N}(0, 5)$. The target of each dataset is binary and is produced using randomly generated linear decision boundaries. To generate the linear decision boundaries, we randomly generated integer coefficients between -10 and 10 and constructed the linear decision functions with those coefficients. Each dataset used one of these functions to generate labels for each sample. We split each dataset into 80% training data and 20% testing data. The test set accuracies of all models fall between .82 and .99. It is important to note that as these datasets all have i.i.d. normal features and there is no noise in the target column, this experiment uses practically ideal conditions for the training and subsequent explanation of ML models.

Since the number of features differs between the datasets, we report the results for our three metrics in the following fashion, conditioned on the number of features. For each dataset, we compute feature-wise mean directionality, mean concordance over M test in-

stances, and mean relevance for $k = 3$ over M test instances. This gives us a single measurement of each metric for each dataset. We partition the results for each dataset based on which of the five equal width bins of $[1,100]$ the associated D falls into. Finally, we report the means within each bin for each metric in Figure 5.

Our experimental results imply that SHAP and LIME explanations do not in general produce faithful information about marginal effects, and also that explanation quality further decreases as the number of features increases. Indeed, Figure 5 shows that, generally when D exceeds 20, mean directionality for SHAP is actually under .5 which is worse than random guessing. LIME’s mean directionality for $D > 20$ is not much better as it is still generally close to .5. This is an alarming sign because the two most popular post hoc explainers can not even get a correct qualitative estimation of the true marginal effect — even the sign is wrong! In addition, both the mean concordance and mean relevance for $k = 3$ are low especially when there are more than 20 features. It is also notable that the more features there are, the more challenging it is for the two explainers to correctly identify the contributions of each feature, as there exist more possible mappings from the input to the output that could be different from that of \mathcal{G} and there is no control over which one \mathcal{M} uses. Overall, we noticed a negative association between D and each of our metrics.




Figure 5: Relationship of number of features D with feature-wise mean directionality, concordance, and relevance for $k = 3$

5.3 Contributing Factors to Misalignment

We investigate factors in the pipeline that contribute to misalignment. Our aim is to provide both theoretical and empirical evidence for why post hoc explanations should not be used to make inferences about the actual input-output relationships underlying data. Our investigation will examine both stages of the explanation pipeline (the prediction stage and the explanation stage). We work under the assumptions that domain knowledge about the data generation process is unavailable. Due to the space limit, we show our experiments on one dataset. However, as robustness check, we repeat each experiment again on a different dataset in the Appendix.

5.3.1 Explainers May Inherently Be Misaligned

We first investigate how explainers themselves contribute to misalignment by deriving and analyzing equations for their explanations of linear models. To exclude other factors in

the explanation pipeline, we assume here that we have access to the ground truth model \mathcal{G} and that SHAP and LIME are directly applied to explaining \mathcal{G} rather than \mathcal{M} . Thus, the explanations are solely based on the explanation stage. We suppose that \mathcal{G} is a simple linear function of D features and SHAP and LIME explain the output of \mathcal{G} at a point $\boldsymbol{\xi}$, that is, $\mathcal{G} = \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}$ where $\mathbf{x} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}_D, \mathbf{I}_{D \times D})$ and $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ is a realization of \mathbf{x} . Below, we derive mathematical representations of SHAP and LIME explanations, and investigate their relationships with the marginal effects $\boldsymbol{\beta}$.

e_{SHAP} when Explaining a Linear Model The importance of the j^{th} feature of the i^{th} data sample $\xi_j^{(i)}$ in a SHAP explanation is the Shapley value for that feature in that sample. The Shapley value reduces to the following expression when SHAP is used to explain a linear model according to Štrumbelj and Kononenko (2014), Lundberg and Lee (2017).

$$e_{\text{SHAP}}(\mathbf{x}_j^{(i)}) = \beta_j(\xi_j^{(i)} - \bar{x}_j). \quad (5)$$

The SHAP explanations outlined by Equation 5 exhibit several undesirable properties that can limit their practical application. For example, when $\boldsymbol{\xi} = \bar{\mathbf{x}}$, the SHAP values e_{SHAP} reduce to 0, leading to all features being deemed unimportant. Moreover, Shapley values generally cannot be used to infer the signs of the marginal effects because when $\xi_j^{(i)} - \bar{x}_j$ is negative, the signs of $e_{\text{SHAP}}(\xi_j^{(i)})$ and β_j are opposite. Another consequence of Equation (5) is that the expected SHAP values average to zero, rendering them generally uninformative about the marginal effects. Some authors address this in their search for global feature importance by instead considering empirical averages of absolute SHAP values (Lenaers and De Moor 2023, Maeng et al. 2023, Guenther et al. 2023). However, this comes at the cost of losing information about the directionality of a feature’s impact.

Following Equation (5), we propose to mitigate SHAP’s inherent misalignment for linear models by using what we will refer to as *normalized SHAP values*: $e_{\text{SHAP}}(\xi_j^{(i)}) / (x_j^{(i)} - \bar{x}_j)$. Although this is a straightforward adjustment that can be made in order to approximate the marginal effects using SHAP, we are not aware of its use in prior literature. Our empirical evaluation of these normalized Shapley values, which includes recalculating directionality, concordance, and comparison with traditional SHAP results (illustrated in Figures 6), suggests significant improvements.

Normalized SHAP values frequently exhibit correct sign alignment and generate feature rankings more concordant with the ground truth. Directionality for features related to “Credit Score” improved remarkably, as shown in Figure 6a. However, directionality for the features related to cosigner access (“Married” and “Cosigner”) decreased. The improvements to feature rankings are evident from Figures 6b and 6c; we can see that mean concordance rose from near 0 to about .6 and relevance was improved substantially for $k = 2, 3, 4, 5$. Normalizing SHAP values evidently gives an advantage.

Given the evident effectiveness of the SHAP normalization scheme and our evidence that unmodified SHAP explanations are theoretically data-misaligned, **we will adopt this normalization approach for all subsequent experiments in this paper**. This is vital as we explore the impacts of \mathcal{M} ’s predictive performance and feature independence in subsequent sections (5.3.2 and 5.3.3).




Figure 6: Comparison of SHAP explanations without and with SHAP value normalization

e_{LIME} when Explaining a Linear Model Recall from Section 2 that LIME’s explanation model is a weighted ridge regressor trained on discretized data sampled around the instance being explained. By discretizing numerical features and using weighted ridge regression (rather than standard least squares), the possibility of LIME’s data-alignment is compromised. The use of discretized features in LIME’s ridge regression model can eliminate critical information about the model being explained. Additionally, the sparsity penalty which is used in ridge regression may zero out coefficients for features that actually have a non-zero marginal effect, distorting the picture one may obtain of the marginal effects. Also, employing weighted ridge regression introduces a weight matrix that further skews the estimation of marginal effects. This distortion can be observed in the closed-form solution of the weighted ridge regression, indicating potential limitations in LIME’s ability to provide accurate estimates under certain conditions.

Having identified the aforementioned properties of LIME’s regression design as contributors to its lack of data-alignment, we derive conditions under which LIME would be data-aligned. We begin this effort by analyzing the large sample behavior of LIME coefficients in an idealized scenario where LIME does not use discretization and the model being explained is a linear function of i.i.d. normal features. Under such idealized assumptions, our Theorem 1 below shows that LIME’s coefficients converge to β as the number of samples N tends to ∞ .

Theorem 1. *Suppose $f : \mathbb{R}^D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that maps $\mathbf{x} \mapsto \beta^T \mathbf{x}$ is explained at a sample ξ drawn from $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}_D, \mathbf{I}_{D \times D})$ with LIME. Suppose further that LIME does not discretize features and samples i.i.d. data points $\mathbf{x}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(N)}$ from $\mathcal{N}(\xi, \mathbf{I}_{D \times D})$ for its regression. Then, in the large sample limit, LIME recovers β .*

Theorem 1 uses an application of the law of large numbers to show that, in the large sample limit of random design matrices \mathbf{X} , LIME recovers β . The practical implication of this theorem is that, when using LIME, N should be large. For a non-asymptotic analysis, see the Appendix.

Remark 1. *Given a fixed number of samples N , ν being too small makes each of LIME’s coefficients close to 0. ν being very large can lead to a better approximation of β .*

Remark 1, which is justified by our non-asymptotic analysis, suggests that when N is fixed and finite, ν should also be set to be large. Notably, (Garreau and Luxburg 2020) obtained these same conclusions about ν and N in the case where discretization is used. Numerical experiments justifying these conclusions, as well as the proof for Theorem 1 and justification of Remark 1 can be found in the appendix.

5.3.2 The Role of the Predictive Power of \mathcal{M}

Another factor in the pipeline that has a significant impact on explanations is the machine learning model \mathcal{M} itself. An explainer \mathcal{E} is never directly applied to \mathcal{G} because \mathcal{G} is not directly observable. Instead, \mathcal{E} is applied to a model \mathcal{M} constructed based on data derived from \mathcal{G} . Consequently, it is reasonable to infer that the fidelity of \mathcal{M} with respect to \mathcal{G} —that is, how accurately \mathcal{M} reflects the true structure of \mathcal{G} —significantly influences the data-alignment of explanations. This fidelity can be reflected by the predictive performance of \mathcal{M} .

It is also worth mentioning that high predictive accuracy of \mathcal{M} does not unequivocally confirm an accurate apprehension of \mathcal{G} , since factors such as multicollinearity might lead to \mathcal{M} making accurate predictions without faithfully capturing the training data’s underlying dynamics. Nevertheless, this nuance does not eliminate the reliability of predictive performance as an indicator of \mathcal{M} ’s quality. Specifically, while high accuracy does not guarantee an accurate apprehension of \mathcal{G} , low accuracy definitively signals that \mathcal{M} fails to represent \mathcal{G} accurately. Therefore, predictive accuracy stands as a limited but reliable measure for assessing \mathcal{M} ’s quality.

We investigate the relationship between the predictive power of \mathcal{M} and the alignment of explanations of \mathcal{M} by comparing SHAP and LIME explanations of NNs \mathcal{M}_1 with ROC AUC approximately equal to 0.60 and \mathcal{M}_3 with AUC equal to 0.99. We also use the NN with AUC .93 from Section 5.1 as an intermediate model \mathcal{M}_2 . When training \mathcal{M}_1 and \mathcal{M}_3 , they start out as the same model (through random seed initialization) but are trained for sufficiently many epochs to achieve their corresponding AUCs of .6 and .93, respectively. Moreover, we follow Equation 5 and normalize the SHAP values in this experiment, thereby bypassing SHAP’s inherent data-misalignment and enabling us to show how increasing model AUC can aid the usage of SHAP. The results are shown in Figure 7 and demonstrate the positive relationship model performance has on data-alignment for both SHAP and LIME.

Figure 7 shows that as the performance of the black box improves, the explanations become more data-aligned with respect to all three metrics. However, it should be noted that despite \mathcal{M}_3 achieving near perfect performance, with an AUC of .99, neither of the two most favored explainers were able to obtain perfect or near perfect data-alignment. They consistently struggled to identify even the fundamental qualitative relationships among variables, such as directionality. This implies that in practical scenarios, even an ML model with perfect accuracy may not enable researchers to interpret the significance—or even the direction—of feature importance in relation to the true marginal effects.

Our results here highlight a significant risk that features presumed to positively influence the outcome may, in fact, have a detrimental effect. This is because ML models are trained




Figure 7: Comparisons of results for our three metrics for SHAP and LIME when explaining \mathcal{M}_1 with AUC=.6, \mathcal{M}_2 with AUC=0.92, and \mathcal{M}_3 with AUC=.99

to produce the correct *predictions*, but not necessarily the correct *mapping* from the input to the predictions, i.e., how features contribute to the predictions could be different from that in the ground truth \mathcal{G} . In fact, there may exist many possible mappings that lead to the same or similarly good predictions, according to the Rashomon set theory (Semenova et al. 2022). This also explains the results in Figure 5 from Section 5.2. As the number of features increases, the number of possible mappings from the input to the predictions grows. This lowers the chance that a machine learning model will capture the correct relationship. Consequently, the crucial insight here is that while constructing an accurate ML model is beneficial, it *does not guarantee* utility in understanding the true relationships in the data.

5.3.3 Role of Feature Independence

The primary goal of training routines for predictive machine learning algorithms is to construct a mapping from the inputs of a dataset to the outputs that correctly labels unseen data. However, a side effect of this focus on predictive performance is that ML models tend to overvalue features that provide information about multiple other features, as these are

strong predictors of the target (Schölkopf et al. 2021). Therefore, the dependence of features can skew their perceived importance in a model, and this importance may be estimated by an explainer and subsequently used to draw incorrect conclusions about the data.

In real-world scenarios, features are typically not mutually independent. Thus, while the ideal model might rely predominantly on some features to determine the correct label, \mathcal{M} might rely more on other features. Consequently, \mathcal{M} can arrive at the same predictions through an alternate mapping. Post hoc explainers then interpret the importance of such features in various ways, further muddying the understanding of features within an ML model.

To demonstrate how interdependent features can impact data-alignment, we generate a modified version of the dataset from Section 4.1 with mutually independent features. Specifically, in this revised dataset, “Credit Score” is independent of all other features rather than being derived from “Credit Utilization,” “Credit Inquiries,” “Delinquencies,” and “Credit History.” Additionally, “Cosigner” is now modeled as a Bernoulli-distributed random variable which is independent of “Married.” In this case, the marginal effects β of \mathcal{G} match the coefficients from Equation (1).

We clarify the role of feature independence by comparing the alignment of explanations of models trained on the revised dataset with mutually independent features and the original dataset with interdependent features. We will begin analyzing our results by considering overall data-alignment. Then we examine alignment with respect to “Married” in order to give an example of how alignment with respect to a feature can be worse if that feature is made to be highly correlated with other features.

Our experiments showed that by making “Credit Score” and “Cosigner” independent, data-alignment increased overall and with respect to “Credit Score” and “Cosigner” in particular. Figures 8a and 8d show that directionality improved for both SHAP and LIME’s with respect to several features, including “Married” and “Cosigner.” The most notable results come from the significant increases in relevance and concordance, especially for LIME. SHAP saw significant gains in relevance for all k except $k = 3, 8, 9$ (see Figure 8c) as well as a large leap in concordance. Figure 8f shows that LIME was adept at identifying the top $k = 1, 2, 3$ most important features when the features were independent while it could rarely (or never) do so when the features were not independent. Its mean concordance was also larger by about .2. It is evident from our results that the interdependence of features obfuscates explainers and leads to incorrect feature importance.

Figure 9 shows bar plots of the directionality achieved by SHAP and LIME with respect to “Married” before and after making “Cosigner” depend on “Married.” The bar plots show that the addition of dependencies between features is associated with a loss of the ability to give “Married” the correct sign for both SHAP and LIME. Figure 10 shows the distributions of the absolute differences between the given and correct rank for “Married” before and after introduction of correlation. We see that for both SHAP and LIME, the average ranking error for “Married” is much smaller when the features are mutually independent than otherwise. These results suggest that it may be more difficult for explainers to extract correct information about the individual marginal effects of interdependent features.




Figure 8: Comparison of faithfulness of explanations of models trained on data with independent features versus data with two strongly correlated features.




Figure 9: Bar charts showing how SHAP and LIME (almost) never can correctly identify the sign of “Married” when it is used to determine “Cosigner.”

5.4 Discussion

Since researchers cannot directly access the ground truth model \mathcal{G} and can only interact with an intermediary machine learning model \mathcal{M} , the process of explanation is bifurcated into two distinct stages: the prediction stage and the explanation stage. To generate explanations




Figure 10: Violin plots showing the differences between the given rank and true rank of “Married” depending on whether “Married” influences “Cosigner.” Lower is better.

that accurately reflect the marginal effects, one must navigate challenges that may arise in either stage, necessitating additional assumptions about the data, \mathcal{M} , and the explanation tool \mathcal{E} . Crucially, \mathcal{E} must possess the ability to accurately capture information regarding the marginal effects. The discussion in Section 5.3.1 describes theoretically why SHAP and LIME are inherently incapable of extracting even qualitative information (e.g. the sign) about the true marginal effects in practice. In addition, even if we presume \mathcal{E} ’s competence in recovering the actual marginal effects, it is essential for \mathcal{M} to closely approximate \mathcal{G} , ensuring that information about the marginal effects is indeed present within \mathcal{M} . Insights from Section 5.3 indicate that \mathcal{M} ’s ability to achieve high predictive accuracy, especially when trained on data featuring mutually independent variables, significantly facilitates the extraction of the marginal effects. However, **SHAP and LIME being data-misaligned appears to be a general phenomenon**, which is more severe when *a model has low predictive performance, the features are not mutually independent, or there are a large number of features.*

6 Mitigation Strategies

In this section, we use the results of our experiments and the implications of the theoretical results from Section 5.3.1 to propose and test some simple mitigation strategies for misalignment. The strategies we propose here are meant to be sufficiently simple to understand and use such that they form a platform for further exploration and experimentation. We soften the impact of our choices for the data and model in this section by using the version of our dataset with mutually independent features and an NN with accuracy and test set ROC AUC equal to .99 in each experiment, unless otherwise stated. To begin the section, we will introduce the criteria we use to test if a strategy improves data-alignment over a baseline with respect to directionality, concordance, and relevance. Then we describe and demonstrate our mitigation strategies, starting with those that are specific to SHAP or LIME and concluding with generally applicable strategies. Using our definitions of improvement, the mitigation strategies we propose are all effective with respect to at least one of the metrics. We provide results for less effective mitigation strategies in Appendix Section 7.7.

6.1 Testing Improvement

This section introduces the hypothesis testing framework that we use to characterize whether an explanation method \mathcal{E}' improves over a baseline explanation \mathcal{E} in terms of directionality, concordance, and relevance. All details, including statements of the null and alternative hypotheses we use, can be found in Appendix Section 7.6.1.

The underlying idea of our identification of improvement is to test if the mean(s) of metrics of interest is(are) higher for \mathcal{E}' than for \mathcal{E} using Wilcoxon signed-rank tests on the location of mean of differences from matched samples. All of our tests are performed with a significance level of $\alpha = .05$.

Our tests of improvement differ between concordance and directionality/relevance because the latter are feature-wise metrics. Since the computation of concordance involves all features, testing if it has been improved consists of a single Wilcoxon signed-rank test involving the matched pairs of concordances for each test instance. However, since directionality is computed for each feature and relevance is computed for $k = 1, \dots, D - 1$, we formulate a rather strict characterization of improvement of \mathcal{E}' over \mathcal{E} that takes into account the possibility that, e.g., \mathcal{E}' may have higher relevance than \mathcal{E} for $k = 1, 2, 3$ but lower relevance for $k = 4$. Our tests for directionality and relevance are meant to capture when \mathcal{E}' has a statistically significant improvement over \mathcal{E} in at least one respect and is not significantly worse than \mathcal{E} in any respect. What this means for directionality is that directionality must have a statistically significant increase for at least one feature and no statistically significant decrease for any feature. Similarly, for relevance, it means that the mean relevance of \mathcal{E}' must be significantly larger than that of \mathcal{E} for at least one k , and not significantly smaller for any k .

6.2 Explainer Specific Strategies

Before discussing general-use strategies, we will present three strategies applicable only to SHAP or LIME (but not both).

6.2.1 Normalizing The Shapley Value

As discussed in Section 5.3.1, it follows directly from the theory underlying SHAP that SHAP explanations do not naturally extract the marginal effect values β . It is therefore worthwhile to seek practical ways to modify our usage of SHAP. Since Equation (5) showed that SHAP returns $e_{\text{SHAP}}(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}) = \beta^T(\mathbf{x}^{(i)} - \bar{\mathbf{x}})$ instead of β , we proposed in Section 5.3.1 to instead take the importance of feature j to be $e_{\text{SHAP}}(x_j^{(i)})/(x_j^{(i)} - \bar{x}_j)$ where \bar{x}_j is the empirical mean of feature j from the training data because this expression should be approximately β_j . Our experiments confirmed the advantage of this strategy: Figure 6 showed that unmodified SHAP explanations perform about as well as random explanations with respect to our three metrics while the normalized SHAP explanations performed significantly better in all three metrics. Therefore, all of our mitigation strategies involving SHAP will make use of the normalization scheme by default.

6.2.2 Increasing ν and N for LIME

Our theoretical results on LIME from Section 5.3.1 imply that LIME’s kernel bandwidth ν and number of perturbed samples N need to be large in order for $e_{\text{LIME}}(x_j)$ to be close to β , so this section will experiment with how their respective sizes affect explanation quality. To show the impact of ν and N , we compare the data-alignment of explanations from LIME explanations using the default choices of $\nu = .75\sqrt{D}$ (where D is the number of features) and $N = 1000$ used in the official LIME implementation (Ribeiro et al. 2016) with explanations LIME explanations which use the larger values $\nu = N = 10000$.

Figure 11 shows that increasing the number of samples N and the kernel bandwidth ν improved data-alignment. For example, for directionality, increasing ν and N improved directionality significantly “Age,” “Cosigner,” and “Sex.” The larger ν and N also resulted in pairs of rankings whose concordances were significantly larger on average.




Figure 11: Comparison of LIME explainer with default settings $\nu = .75\sqrt{D} \simeq 2.37$, $N = 1000$ versus $\nu = N = 10000$ with respect to our three metrics

6.2.3 Averaging Explanations of One Model by Different Explainers

Since there exists randomness in LIME (the random seed, the sampling, etc.), the feature importance may not be exactly the same if LIME is run multiple times. This is a problematic property of LIME since its explanations could be inconsistent (Alvarez-Melis and Jaakkola 2018) as a result of this randomness. However, we propose that it can actually be leveraged into an advantage. Each explanation likely has at least a modicum of truth, and so an aggregation strategy for explanations may increase the signal-to-noise ratio. We propose here one simple realization of this general idea. Given one ML model \mathcal{M} and instance \mathbf{x} , we leverage the abundance of possible LIME explanations of $\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{x})$ by averaging the feature importance values given by a set of LIME explainers with different random seeds.

To test this technique, we compare explanations averaged from 100 LIMEs with explanations from one LIME of $M = 100$ applications. Our statistical tests of improvement concluded that directionality, concordance, and relevance were significantly improved by using averaged instead of single LIME explanations. Averaging LIME explanations resulted in

an enhanced ability to find the sign of “Age,” “Sex,” “Married” and “Cosigner” (see Figure 12a). Moreover, the concordances of the averaged explanations were significantly higher than those of the single explanations. Thus, when an explanation method has hyperparameters that affect the explanations it produces, it may be worthwhile to leverage the explanations of multiple instances of that explainer.




Figure 12: Comparisons of results for our three metrics for explanations of an NN \mathcal{M} by 1 LIME explainer versus those created by averaging the feature importance values of 100 LIME explanations of \mathcal{M}

6.3 General Strategies

We now provide three general strategies that can be applied to both SHAP and LIME to produce explanations that are more data-aligned. Note that we have been and will continue using normalized Shapley values, since default SHAP explanations are not better than random with respect to data-alignment.

6.3.1 Optimizing the Tradeoff between Complexity and Predictive Power

The hypothesis space, which encompasses the set of all possible machine learning models that can be constructed for any dataset of practical utility, is unimaginably large, making model selection challenging from the outset. Further complicating this process is the existence of many models with similar predictive performance, a concept known as the Rashomon set theory (Semenova et al. 2022). Given that notions of complexity, such as parameter count, are fundamental distinguishing properties of models, the statistics literature on parsimony in curve fitting often appeals to Occam’s razor—plurality should not be posited without necessity—suggesting that simpler models are more likely to be correct than complex ones (Popper 2005).

For this reason, we designed a mitigation strategy that takes into account the complexity of \mathcal{M} . As we established in Section 5.3.2, there is an association between the predictive performance of \mathcal{M} and the alignment of post hoc explanations of \mathcal{M} with respect to \mathcal{G} . This




Figure 13: Comparisons of results for our three metrics for SHAP (top row) and LIME (bottom row) explanations of equally accurate NNs with high and low complexity.

mitigation strategy proposes ensuring that \mathcal{M} achieves both good predictive performance and minimal complexity. To implement this strategy, one can iteratively train and evaluate models of successively lower complexity, stopping the process once a reduction in complexity results in a significant decrease in predictive performance.

To investigate the trade-off between model complexity and data-alignment, we compare the SHAP and LIME explanations of two neural networks (NNs) with differing complexities but nearly identical predictive performance. The first NN, \mathcal{M}_1 , has 100 nodes in its hidden layer (the default in sklearn) and achieves a test set AUC of approximately 0.99. The second, simpler NN, \mathcal{M}_2 , has only two nodes in its hidden layer, yet it still achieves a test set AUC of around 0.98. Figure 13 visualizes our comparison of the explanations provided by SHAP and LIME for \mathcal{M}_1 and \mathcal{M}_2 .

We found that, by explaining the simpler NN \mathcal{M}_2 instead of the more complex \mathcal{M}_1 , it was possible to get more data-aligned explanations. In particular, SHAP’s directionality for “Age and “Credit History,” as well as SHAP’s relevance for $k = 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7$ were increased significantly. For LIME, directionality was improved for “Married,” concordance was significantly improved overall, and relevance was significantly increased for $k = 2, 6$. Overall,

these results suggest that explanations of simpler models can be more data-aligned than explanations of more complex models with equivalent predictive performance.

A reason that the explanations of the simple model \mathcal{M}_2 were more data-aligned is that even though \mathcal{M}_1 and \mathcal{M}_2 may have similar behavior in how they generate training and test set label predictions, the additional expressive power of \mathcal{M}_1 allows the local behavior of its decision boundary to be more erratic. Given that SHAP and LIME are local function approximators, incorrect local behavior of \mathcal{M}_1 imposes a limitation on how data-aligned SHAP and LIME can be when explaining \mathcal{M}_1 .

6.3.2 Averaging Explanations of Different Models

The rapid proliferation of new machine learning models and methods has made it increasingly challenging for researchers to decide which model to use and ultimately explain. Based on the Rashomon set theory (Semenova et al. 2022, Wang et al. 2022, Donnelly et al. 2023), a straightforward approach to addressing the uncertainty about which black box model to explain is to train multiple models, generate explanations for each, and then average those explanations. This method incorporates diverse information from the hypothesis space under consideration into the final (averaged) explanation.

With this in mind, we repeat the experiments of Section 5.1 twice: first using explanations for a single model, and then averaging explanations for 10 unique neural networks (NNs) with ROC AUC scores of at least 0.9. The averaged explanations are constructed separately for SHAP and LIME in the following manner. Given an applicant, 10 explanations are obtained, one for each NN. These explanations are averaged to create a final averaged feature importance vector. We aim to test whether these averaged explanations offer an improvement over singular explanations in terms of data-alignment.

Our feature importance averaging strategy showed some promise but the results of our Wilcoxon tests for improvement of data-alignment were not consistent between SHAP and LIME. The differences are visualized in Figure 14. Regarding SHAP, Figures 14a and Figure 14b show that there was a large improvement in directionality for “Age” and small improvements in directionality for many other features. However, even with the mitigation, SHAP did not have perfect directionality for as many features as LIME did. It also had no discernible difference in concordance. Showing a stark contrast with SHAP, LIME’s directionality, concordance, and relevance were all significantly improved. Directionality for “Cosigner,” “Married,” and “Sex” were significantly improved. Directionality for the other features was perfect for the other features both with and without the mitigation. In contrast, for SHAP, there was no significant change to directionality for any feature, no significant change to concordance, and no significant change to relevance for any k . Given these results, we can only adduce that this strategy is effective for LIME. In particular, it was effective in increasing directionality and concordance, but not relevance.

6.4 Summary and Discussion of Mitigation Strategies

The primary results of our mitigation experiments suggest that when using SHAP, it is advisable to normalize the Shapley values. For LIME, it may be beneficial to aggregate the explanations from multiple LIME instances, with each individual LIME explainer configured




Figure 14: Comparisons of data-alignment for SHAP (top row) and LIME (bottom row) explanations of 1 NN versus explanations constructed by averaging the feature importance values of 10 NNs.

with large values for ν and N . Additionally, it is recommended to select black box models that strike an optimal balance between complexity and predictive power, and to average explanations across ensembles of explainer and/or models.

We discuss two unsuccessful mitigation strategies in the Appendix, both based on aggregating explanations of a single black box. The first exchanges the previously used simple averaging of LIME explanations for a method of ranked choice voting known as the Borda count and the second averages SHAP and LIME explanations together. We believe that a core reason why these two strategies were unsuccessful is that they only involve a single black box model. Finding common (valid) patterns within multiple black boxes is possible by aggregating explanations of those models, whereas aggregations of explanations of a single black box can at best reveal the single, imperfect, pattern identified by that black box. Ignoring bias and error in the dataset, each explanation has two layers of approximation error with respect to the ground truth, whereas each black box has only its own approximation error and captures different patterns in the training data. Thus, researchers may find averaging feature importance values obtained by many models both a useful and intuitive

strategy (Dong and Rudin 2020, Donnelly et al. 2023).

Researchers who would like to investigate the importance and impact of features in the data may find exploring the following general strategy useful. When starting the prediction stage, the dataset should be pre-processed to remove highly correlated features.¹⁰ Having pre-processed the data, researchers are encouraged to train $B \geq 1$ black box models with simple enough decision boundaries to not lose too much predictive performance compared to more complex models.¹¹ To construct a more robust explanation of a model’s predicted outcome for an instance, the results of multiple explainers of that model can be aggregated by, e.g., averaging the feature importance values for each feature over the explainers. An even more robust final explanation for an instance can be produced by averaging over the importance values given in the $B \times E$ explanations of the predictions of B models by E explainers.

6.5 Case Study Using Real Data and Econometric Method

To validate the efficacy of our mitigation strategies and demonstrate their practical application, we test whether they provide an advantage over the default usage of SHAP and LIME in extracting the same marginal effects as those identified in an econometric study on home loan application approvals (Bane and Krishnan 2006). Specifically, we will adapt the framework outlined in Section 6.4 to create mitigated pipelines for SHAP and LIME separately.

The home loan dataset is publicly available and originates from a study by the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston (Hunter and Walker 1996b). We consider the ground truth β to be the coefficients of the logistic regression model obtained in Bane and Krishnan (2006)’s analysis of that dataset. This assumption is justifiable because econometric modeling is well-suited to capture β . The linear ground truth model derived from their logistic regression model is presented in Equation (6), and the meanings and ranges of each feature are provided in Table 3 in the Appendix.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}(X) = & .8 + 3.5 \cdot \text{good credit} + 4.7 \cdot \text{purchaser type} - 4.4 \cdot \text{PMI approved} - .4 \cdot \text{multi family} \\ & - 2.5 \cdot \text{unver} + .9 \cdot \text{fixed rate} - 1.4 \cdot \text{bankruptcy} - .9 \cdot \text{value rate} - .03 \cdot \text{debt rate} \\ & - .7 \cdot \text{old} + .8 \cdot \text{married} - .8 \cdot \text{gift}. \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Our mitigated pipelines for SHAP and LIME are applications of the mitigation framework outlined in Section 6.4. First, we split the dataset into 80% training data and 20% testing data. Then, we trained a family of 210 neural networks (NNs) using a parameter grid with hidden layer nodes ranging from 2 to 100 and random seeds from 1 to 10. From this family, we selected the 10 NNs with the fewest hidden layer nodes that also achieved a test set AUC no more than $\epsilon = 0.02$ lower than the highest AUC observed within the family (.93). For each of these 10 NNs, we produced $E = 10$ SHAP and LIME explainers.

¹⁰If possible, adjustments can be made to account for confounding. Tools like E-values (Gaster et al. 2023) and Pearl’s backdoor criterion can be used for this purpose.

¹¹Ideally, Rashomon sets of models would be constructed and the simplest models in them would be collected. However, at the time of writing, this is only possible for decision trees and GAMs.




Figure 15: Improvements due to use of recommended pipeline instead of one without any of our mitigation strategies

The mitigated LIME pipeline utilizes all 10 NNs, with 10 LIME explainers for each NN. Each LIME explainer is configured with $\nu = N = 10,000$. Since SHAP is deterministic and the NN averaging strategy did not significantly improve directionality and concordance for SHAP, we use $B = E = 1$ for SHAP and normalize the Shapley values. For comparison, baseline explanations are derived from a single NN with an accuracy of 0.86 and a ROC AUC of 0.93, using individual SHAP and LIME explainers with default settings.

Both the SHAP and LIME variants of our general strategy showed improvements over the baseline in at least one respect. These improvements are illustrated in Figure 15. Specifically, our strategy applied to SHAP significantly enhanced directionality for all features except two (“gldin” and “gift”) and also substantially improved both concordance and relevance. When applied to LIME, our strategy significantly improved overall concordance, greatly enhanced directionality for the features “fixadj,” “gift,” and “obrat,” and significantly increased relevance for the top 2, 3, and 4 features.

7 Discussion and Conclusion

As post hoc explanations are gaining popularity in business research, we found an alarming trend of using them to make claims about the marginal effects of variables in the data. However, the validity of this use of post hoc explanations has not been studied in the literature. Our paper is the first effort towards this purpose. In the following sections, we will summarize our findings and give some parting advice for the use of post hoc explainers for obtaining data insights in business research. We also contribute to the business literature by proposing some simple and intuitive mitigation strategies which we found to benefit explainer data-alignment to varying extents.

7.1 Main Findings

Our paper contributes several important findings to the use of post hoc explanations in business research.

First, through an extensive literature review, we found that the use of post hoc explanations to infer information about the data is quite prevalent. In the 150 papers we reviewed, 63 used SHAP or LIME to draw conclusions about the $X \rightarrow Y$ relationship instead of the $\mathcal{M}(X) \rightarrow \hat{Y}$ relationship. Such use deviates from the intended purpose of post hoc explainers; they are designed to explain the machine learning model, not to extract information about the data. Identifying this misuse of post hoc explanations is an important contribution of this paper. Note that while post hoc explanations have been first introduced and widely used in the machine learning community, the issue we discuss in this paper is less of a concern for that community because computer scientists are more interested in explaining the machine learning models. They use post hoc explainers to understand a model’s behavior in order to diagnose and debug the model. However, the goal of business researchers is to understand the data and the underlying phenomena, making this issue more pertinent in business research.

Second, we provide both theoretical and empirical evidence that SHAP and LIME explanations are, in fact, not data-aligned. In our investigation, we discovered that SHAP and LIME incorrectly represent the signs and relative importance of the marginal effects of the explanatory variables. As shown in Section 5.3, SHAP and LIME tend to be data-misaligned even in scenarios where they explain an accurate machine learning model trained on data whose features are mutually independent and whose target is derived from a simple linear ground truth model - scenarios which are, in a sense, ideal. This observation suggests a need for caution when interpreting variable relationships based on post hoc explanations. It opens up a dialogue about the complexities of deriving accurate insights from machine learning models via post hoc explainers, contributing to a deeper understanding of their limitations and paving the way for future research in this area. In light of these insights, it may be beneficial for the academic community to revisit prior analyses that have relied heavily on post hoc explanations. This reassessment could ensure that interpretations and conclusions drawn from such models are robust and reflective of their underlying dynamics. Our findings underscore the importance of continuous critical evaluation in the field, especially as we seek to refine our understanding and application of these explanatory tools.

Third, we find that the reason for lack of data-alignment is different for SHAP and LIME.

Achieving data-alignment using SHAP feature importance values is inherently impossible due to the nature of Shapley values. Shapley values represent a feature’s contribution to a prediction by considering not only the feature’s marginal effect but also its value and the influence of other variables within the explanation process. In the particular case where SHAP explains a linear model, the vector of Shapley values is given by $\beta(\xi - \bar{\mathbf{x}})$, diverging from a direct representation of β . Moreover, LIME’s data-misalignment arises from the mechanics of its default ridge regression approach. Our analysis, supported by Theorem 1, indicates that LIME could achieve data-alignment by avoiding the discretization of numerical inputs, sampling many points for its synthetic regression problem, and opting for a significantly larger bandwidth than the default. Yet, even with these adjustments, common properties of real-world data such as correlated variables often hinder the attainment of data-alignment. Nonetheless, it is noteworthy that our evaluations generally reveal *LIME to provide explanations more aligned with the ground truth compared to SHAP*.

Finally, we identify several mitigation strategies that show promise in enhancing the data-alignment of explanations across various stages of the explanation pipeline. These strategies, validated through empirical testing, offer significant improvements in aligning explanations more closely with marginal effects. However, it is important to acknowledge that none of the strategies can guarantee complete congruence with marginal effects. This absence of a full guarantee means that while explanations may sometimes align closely with the marginal effects, they cannot reliably do so. Such a scenario potentially restricts the applicability of post hoc explanations for extracting data insights, as users may remain uncertain about the extent to which these explanations accurately mirror the underlying the marginal effect structure. This limitation underscores the need for cautious interpretation and application of post hoc explanation methods in practical scenarios.

7.2 On the Use of Post Hoc Explanations

We want to emphasize that this paper focuses on the issue of using post hoc explanations to make inferences about the data. We do not explore their use in explaining the machine learning model \mathcal{M} or its predictions $\mathcal{M}(X)$, which is the primary intended purpose of post hoc explainers. However, it is important to note that even this intended use of post hoc explainers is controversial (Garreau and von Luxburg 2020, Alvarez-Melis and Jaakkola 2018, Kumar et al. 2020, Jacovi et al. 2023). For the scope of this paper, our discussion is solely focused on inferring ground truth information from \mathcal{G} through the explanations for \mathcal{M} .

7.2.1 General Usage

While this paper recommends against using post hoc explanations to make any definite claims about data, it does not mean that post hoc explanations cannot be used at all. Instead of using them as a tool to **validate** hypotheses and viewing the explanations as evidence, we propose to use post hoc explanations to **propose** hypotheses that can guide subsequent efforts after they are corroborated. Further analyses are necessary because hypotheses produced by explainers are not guaranteed to be correct and can be performed using tools that are more suited to identification of causal relationships. For example, Zhang and Luo (2023)

follow up their search for important features for restaurant survival using SHAP by using causal forests to estimate the treatment effects of those features. Similarly, Hanauer et al. (2022) use traditional regression as a trusted baseline that they compare SHAP explanations to.

7.2.2 Can SHAP be Used as an Alternative to Econometrics Methods?

We discuss whether SHAP can be used as an alternative to traditional econometric modeling because this type of usage was a pattern we found in our literature review. That is, researchers were motivated to use SHAP explanations of an ML model to obtain feature importance values because of perceived advantages XAI has over regression analysis. The most commonly cited advantage is that, unlike traditional least squares regression methods, SHAP explanations automatically include nonlinearities and interactions Hanauer et al. (2022), Berger (2023), Srivastava et al. (2023), Banulescu-Radu and Yankol-Schalck (2023), Li et al. (2024). For example, Berger (2023) describes their motivation to use SHAP by asserting that SHAP can provide similar economic insights to pooled OLS *and* capture the non-linear impacts of features. Srivastava et al. (2023), which expresses the desire to use and explain ML models with SHAP in order to find factors driving energy consumption because ML models can “detect highly complex interactions between drivers of energy consumption,” is an example of this. Furthermore, Zhou et al. (2023) says that XAI methodology is appealing because it does not necessitate “...the construction of more intermediate variables and complex statistical analysis.” Similarly, Banulescu-Radu and Yankol-Schalck (2023) are drawn away from logistic regression because it suffers when a large number of predictors are used. Hanauer et al. (2022) choose not to use traditional linear regression analysis used for fundamental stock analysis and instead explain random forest and XGBoost models because the ML models deal with non-linearities, interactions, and noisy features. Li et al. (2024) makes inferences about bike sharing by explaining their XGBoost model instead of examining the coefficients of their linear regression because the XGBoost had better predictive performance.

The fact that SHAP is a local explainer makes its use for obtaining global feature importance unnatural, and this is a shortcoming that SHAP has in comparison to econometric modeling. We found that authors often circumvented SHAP’s status as a local explainer by computing the average of the absolute Shapley values over their test set and using the results as measures of global feature importance. Lenaers and De Moor (2023), Maeng et al. (2023), Guenther et al. (2023) are all examples. This obviously comes at the cost of losing any indication of the directionality of impact by features. However, they must do this because the means of signed Shapley values should be 0 due to Equation 5. This is usually the case empirically; Lenaers and De Moor (2023), Maeng et al. (2023), Jiang et al. (2024) all show scatter plots of the signed Shapley values of each feature over their dataset and the empirical distributions of the Shapley values are almost always centered at 0. Equation 5 implies that the expected absolute Shapley value for feature X_j is proportional to β_j , but also a function of the mean and standard deviation of X_j . So, unless all of the X_j are identically distributed, the expected absolute Shapley values may not be comparable for the sake of relative importance in the same way as the β_j . In other words, a ranking of the average absolute Shapley values may be different than the ranking of the $|\beta_j|$.

7.3 General Concerns About Using Post Hoc Explainers to Get Data Insights

Although our paper only studies the two post hoc explainers that are most widely used, our concerns about extracting data insights through post hoc explainers are more general. The Rashomon effect (Semenova et al. 2022, Donnelly et al. 2023, Rudin et al. 2024) of machine learning models tells us that in any given learning problem there can be an abundance of models with near optimal predictive performance. Each model represents a different hypothesis about the relationship between \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{y} , so the fact that there are many near-optimal hypotheses means that even a perfect explanation of a single model is unlikely to be a true and comprehensive summary of the true relationships hidden in \mathcal{G} . Another way to view this problem is to consider the predictions of any machine learning models as the destinations and the decision-making process within a machine learning model is the route that takes an input \mathbf{x} to the output y . While many machine learning models can reach the destination (similarly good performance), their routes (the mapping between \mathbf{x} and y) may be very different. And there is no guarantee that any particular machine learning captures the true mapping in \mathcal{G} .

On the other hand, even if a user had access to \mathcal{G} itself, they would still need to be concerned about how they choose and use explainer(s) \mathcal{E} . As we illustrated in Section 6, it is challenging to decide how to use explainers in a principled manner.

Explainable machine learning (XAI) is a relatively young field, having begun in the late 2010s as a subfield of machine learning and only recently being explored as a means of explaining ground truths \mathcal{G} rather than models \mathcal{M} . A principal challenge consists in the fact that XAI has not yet figured out best practices for extracting information about \mathcal{G} in a way that mitigates the Rashomon effect. After all, the first post hoc explainer that aims to directly mitigate the Rashomon effect (RID Donnelly et al. (2023)) was only published in 2023.

7.4 Final Remarks

This paper aims to highlight the issue with a rising use of post hoc explanations that we identify as inappropriate. To demonstrate the seriousness of this problem, we show that the misalignment occurs even in the simplest context, where the ground truth \mathcal{G} is linear and features are mutually independent. Even in this simple case, SHAP and LIME produce misaligned explanations. Additionally, explanation quality seems to be limited by feature dimensionality. This being the case expect that in realistic business applications, the data-alignment of post hoc explainers can only be worse than what we have shown in our paper. Real decision processes are often non-linear and involve feature interactions and unobservable features; naturally, these added complexities should reduce the efficacy of SHAP and LIME, making it even more challenging to obtain data-aligned explanations. Given the uncertainty regarding the validity of post hoc explanations, researchers should view them skeptically and consider them as hypotheses rather than definitive claims about reality.

Acknowledgements

We thank Zhongju Zhang, Tat Chan, Shan Huang, and Katherine Ragodos for comments which greatly improved the manuscript. We are grateful to Palle Jorgensen for sharing his wisdom and perspective on the mathematical portions of this work. We would also like to thank the participants of the 2024 Hong Kong Quant Marketing Mini-Conference, BizAI Conference, Production and Operations Management Society (POMS) Conference, Workshop on Information Technologies and Systems (WITS), as well as the participants of the 2023 INFORMS annual meeting and INFORMS Workshop on Data Mining & Decision Analytics.

References

- Agarwal S, Jabbari S, Agarwal C, Upadhyay S, Wu S, Lakkaraju H (2021) Towards the unification and robustness of perturbation and gradient based explanations. Meila M, Zhang T, eds., *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 139 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, 110–119 (PMLR), URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v139/agarwal21c.html>.
- Alvarez-Melis D, Jaakkola TS (2018) On the robustness of interpretability methods. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.08049* .
- Bane V, Krishnan P (2006) Econometric study of home loan approvals using statistical methods. *International Journal of Operations and Quantitative Management* 12(3):231.
- Banulescu-Radu D, Yankol-Schalck M (2023) Practical guideline to efficiently detect insurance fraud in the era of machine learning: A household insurance case. *Journal of Risk and Insurance* .
- Berger T (2023) Explainable artificial intelligence and economic panel data: A study on volatility spillover along the supply chains. *Finance Research Letters* 54:103757, ISSN 1544-6123.
- Calcagnini G, Giombini G, Lenti E (2014) Gender differences in bank loan access: An empirical analysis. *Italian Economic Journal* 1(2):193–217.
- Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (2022) Can a lender or broker consider my age when deciding whether to give me a mortgage or home equity loan? <https://www.consumerfinance.gov/ask-cfpb/can-a-lender-or-broker-consider-my-age-when-deciding-whether-to-give-me-a-mortgage-or-home-equity-loan/>
- DeYoung J, Jain S, Rajani NF, Lehman E, Xiong C, Socher R, Wallace BC (2020) Eraser: A benchmark to evaluate rationalized nlp models. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* URL <https://par.nsf.gov/biblio/10156029>.
- Dong J, Rudin C (2020) Variable importance clouds: A way to explore variable importance for the set of good models.
- Donnelly J, Katta S, Rudin C, Browne EP (2023) The rashomon importance distribution: Getting rid of unstable, single model-based variable importance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.13775* .
- Friedman JH (2001) Greedy function approximation: A gradient boosting machine. *The Annals of Statistics* 29(5):1189 – 1232.
- Garreau D, Luxburg U (2020) Explaining the explainer: A first theoretical analysis of lime. *International conference on artificial intelligence and statistics*, 1287–1296 (PMLR).

- Garreau D, von Luxburg U (2020) Looking deeper into tabular lime. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.11092* .
- Gaster T, Eggertsen CM, Støvring H, Ehrenstein V, Petersen I (2023) Quantifying the impact of unmeasured confounding in observational studies with the e value. *BMJ medicine* 2(1).
- Guenther DA, Peterson K, Searcy J, Williams BM (2023) How useful are tax disclosures in predicting effective tax rates? a machine learning approach. *The Accounting Review* 98(5):297–322.
- Han T, Srinivas S, Lakkaraju H (2022) Which explanation should i choose? a function approximation perspective to characterizing post hoc explanations. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 35.
- Hanauer MX, Kononova M, Rapp MS (2022) Boosting agnostic fundamental analysis: Using machine learning to identify mispricing in european stock markets. *Finance Research Letters* 48:102856.
- Hoeffding W (1994) Probability inequalities for sums of bounded random variables. *The collected works of Wassily Hoeffding* 409–426.
- Hunter W, Walker M (1996a) The cultural affinity hypothesis and mortgage lending decisions. *The journal of real estate finance and economics* 13(1):57–70, ISSN 0895-5638.
- Hunter WC, Walker MB (1996b) The cultural affinity hypothesis and mortgage lending decisions. *The Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics* 13:57–70.
- Jacovi A, Bastings J, Gehrmann S, Goldberg Y, Filippova K (2023) Diagnosing ai explanation methods with folk concepts of behavior. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research* 78:459–489.
- Jiang P, Liu Z, Abedin MZ, Wang J, Yang W, Dong Q (2024) Profit-driven weighted classifier with interpretable ability for customer churn prediction. *Omega* 125:103034, ISSN 0305-0483.
- Kleinberg J, Ludwig J, Mullainathan S, Obermeyer Z (2015) Prediction policy problems. *American Economic Review* 105(5):491–495.
- Kumar IE, Venkatasubramanian S, Scheidegger C, Friedler S (2020) Problems with shapley-value-based explanations as feature importance measures. *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 5491–5500 (PMLR).
- Lakkaraju H, Kamar E, Caruana R, Leskovec J (2017) Interpretable & explorable approximations of black box models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.01154* .
- Lenaers I, De Moor L (2023) Exploring xai techniques for enhancing model transparency and interpretability in real estate rent prediction: A comparative study. *Finance Research Letters* 58:104306, ISSN 1544-6123.
- Li X, Ha J, Lee S (2024) Unveiling the roles of public bike systems: From leisure to multimodal transportation. *Travel Behaviour and Society* 34:100705, ISSN 2214-367X.
- Ligons G (2023) Introduction to credit and fico® scores. https://www.foc-network.org/Intro_to_Credit_FICO_Scores_10.8.19.pdf.
- Lundberg SM, Erion GG, Lee SI (2018) Consistent individualized feature attribution for tree ensembles. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.03888* .
- Lundberg SM, Lee SI (2017) A unified approach to interpreting model predictions. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30.
- Luss R, Chen PY, Dhurandhar A, Sattigeri P, Zhang Y, Shanmugam K, Tu CC (2021) Leveraging latent features for local explanations. *Proceedings of the 27th ACM SIGKDD conference on knowledge discovery & data mining*, 1139–1149.

- Maeng Y, Lee CC, Yun H (2023) Understanding antecedents that affect customer evaluations of head-mounted display vr devices through text mining and deep neural network. *Journal of theoretical and applied electronic commerce research* 18(3):1238–1256, ISSN 0718-1876.
- Markus AF, Kors JA, Rijnbeek PR (2021) The role of explainability in creating trustworthy artificial intelligence for health care: a comprehensive survey of the terminology, design choices, and evaluation strategies. *Journal of biomedical informatics* 113:103655.
- Montavon G, Samek W, Müller KR (2018) Methods for interpreting and understanding deep neural networks. *Digital signal processing* 73:1–15.
- Mothilal RK, Sharma A, Tan C (2020) Explaining machine learning classifiers through diverse counterfactual explanations. *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency* (ACM).
- Mullainathan S, Spiess J (2017) Machine learning: An applied econometric approach. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 31(2):87–106.
- Nguyen Ap, Rodríguez Martínez M (2020) On quantitative aspects of model interpretability.
- Park S, Kim H (2024) Extracting product design guidance from online reviews: An explainable neural network-based approach. *Expert Systems with Applications* 236:121357.
- Popper K (2005) *The logic of scientific discovery* (Routledge).
- Ribeiro MT, Singh S, Guestrin C (2016) “why should i trust you?” explaining the predictions of any classifier. *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery and data mining*, 1135–1144.
- Rudin C, Zhong C, Semenova L, Seltzer M, Parr R, Liu J, Katta S, Donnelly J, Chen H, Boner Z (2024) Amazing things come from having many good models. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.04846>.
- Sánchez-Franco MJ, Rey-Tienda S (2023) The role of user-generated content in tourism decision-making: an exemplary study of andalusia, spain. *Management Decision* .
- Schölkopf B, Locatello F, Bauer S, Ke NR, Kalchbrenner N, Goyal A, Bengio Y (2021) Toward causal representation learning. *Proceedings of the IEEE* 109(5):612–634.
- Semenova L, Rudin C, Parr R (2022) On the existence of simpler machine learning models. *2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency* (ACM), URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/3531146.3533232>.
- Spearman C (1904) The proof and measurement of association between two things. *The American Journal of Psychology* 15(1).
- Srivastava PR, Mangla SK, Eachempati P, Tiwari AK (2023) An explainable artificial intelligence approach to understanding drivers of economic energy consumption and sustainability. *Energy Economics* 125:106868, ISSN 0140-9883.
- Wang ZJ, Zhong C, Xin R, Takagi T, Chen Z, Chau DH, Rudin C, Seltzer M (2022) Timbertrek: exploring and curating sparse decision trees with interactive visualization. *2022 IEEE Visualization and Visual Analytics (VIS)*, 60–64 (IEEE).
- Zhang M, Luo L (2023) Can consumer-posted photos serve as a leading indicator of restaurant survival? evidence from yelp. *Management Science* 69(1):25–50.
- Zhou J, Gandomi AH, Chen F, Holzinger A (2021) Evaluating the quality of machine learning explanations: A survey on methods and metrics. *Electronics* 10(5), ISSN 2079-9292, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/electronics10050593>.
- Zhou L, Shi X, Bao Y, Gao L, Ma C (2023) Explainable artificial intelligence for digital finance and consumption upgrading. *Finance Research Letters* 58:104489, ISSN 1544-6123.

Štrumbelj E, Kononenko I (2014) Explaining prediction models and individual predictions with feature contributions. *Knowledge and information systems* 41(3):647–665, ISSN 0219-1377.

Appendix A: Proofs and Numerical Analysis

The proof for Theorem 1 as well as justification for Remark 1 are provided below. We also provide simulation experiments that empirically confirm the the assertions of Remark 1. Required lemmas are also proven.

7.5 Theorem 1 Proof

Theorem Setting To investigate the limitations of LIME, we consider the simple case of explaining a linear function $f : \mathbb{R}^D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $f(\mathbf{x}) = \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}$ at the point $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^D$ (which itself was sampled from $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}_D, \mathbf{I}_{D \times D})$) using a LIME explainer with the following properties. Suppose that LIME samples random vectors $\{\mathbf{x}^{(n)}\}_{n=1}^N$ with $\mathbf{x}^{(n)} \sim \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\xi}, \mathbf{I}_{D \times D})$ for each n and, given a bandwidth parameter $\nu > 0$, weights their distances to $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ using its default exponential kernel $\pi(\boldsymbol{\xi}, \mathbf{x}) = \exp(-\|\boldsymbol{\xi} - \mathbf{x}\|_2^2 / 2\nu^2)$.

We assume that LIME follows its default settings to solve a ridge regression problem, minimizing the following loss function to obtain a feature importance vector $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$.

$$(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\mathbf{u})^T \mathbf{W}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\mathbf{u}) + (\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_0)^T \Delta(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_0)$$

In this loss function, $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times D}$ is a data matrix whose n^{th} row is $\mathbf{x}^{(n)}$ and $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ is a diagonal weight matrix for each of the $n = 1, \dots, N$ samples with $w_{nn} = \pi(\boldsymbol{\xi}, \mathbf{x}^{(n)}) = \exp(-\|\boldsymbol{\xi} - \mathbf{x}^{(n)}\|_2^2 / 2\nu^2)$. The response vector $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ is defined pointwise by $y^{(n)} = \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}^{(n)}$.

The ridge penalty parameter $\Delta \in \mathbb{R}^{D \times D}$ has $\Delta = \lambda \mathbf{I}_{D \times D}$ so that Δ represents the ridge penalty with hyperparameter $\lambda = 1$. As we shall see, λ does not matter because LIME does not set it to scale with N . There is also another hyperparameter $\mathbf{u}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^D$ which is the target that \mathbf{u} is to be shrunken toward. By default, it is $\mathbf{0}_D$.

In the proof, n will be used to index the N data samples. i and j will be used to index the D features. Individual data samples in the data matrix \mathbf{X} will be represented with superscript notation, e.g., $\mathbf{x}^{(n)}$. Individual features of a sample will be indexed with subscript notation, e.g. $x_j^{(n)}$. We need not refer to whole rows or columns of \mathbf{W} , so it will be indexed entry-wise with w_{nn} for $n = 1, \dots, N$. Finally, we will use the Dirac delta function $\delta_{i=j}$, which is 1 when $i = j$ and 0 otherwise.

Theorem 1 Suppose $f : \mathbb{R}^D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that maps $\mathbf{x} \mapsto \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}$ is explained at a sample $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ drawn from $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}_D, \mathbf{I}_{D \times D})$ with LIME. Suppose further that LIME does not discretize features and samples i.i.d. data points $\mathbf{x}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(N)}$ from $\mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\xi}, \mathbf{I}_{D \times D})$ for its regression. Then, in the large sample limit, LIME recovers $\boldsymbol{\beta}$.

Proof. The main idea underlying the proof is to apply the law of large numbers to a closed form solution to generalized ridge regression. Using the notation previously established, we can write a closed form solution of the regression as

$$\hat{\mathbf{u}} = (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{X} + \mathbf{I})^{-1} (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{y}) \tag{7}$$

Here, $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$ is a point estimate using a single sample of data \mathbf{X} . By simple algebraic manipulation we have, equivalently,

$$\hat{\mathbf{u}} = (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{X} + \mathbf{I})^{-1} (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{X}) \boldsymbol{\beta}$$

Let us define $\hat{\Sigma} = \frac{1}{N}(\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{X} + \mathbf{I})$ and $\hat{\Gamma} = \frac{1}{N} \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{X}$ so that $\hat{\mathbf{u}} = \hat{\Sigma}^{-1} \hat{\Gamma} \boldsymbol{\beta}$.

We may write $\hat{\Sigma}$ and $\hat{\Gamma}$ entry-wise as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} (\hat{\Sigma})_{ij} &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N (x_i^{(n)} w_{nn} x_j^{(n)} + \delta_{i=j}) \\ (\hat{\Gamma})_{ij} &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N x_i^{(n)} w_{nn} x_j^{(n)} \end{aligned}$$

Above, $\delta_{i=j}$ represents the Dirac delta function which is 1 when $i = j$ and 0 otherwise. For fixed i, j , the sequence of random variables $x_i^{(1)} w_{11} x_j^{(1)}, \dots, x_i^{(N)} w_{NN} x_j^{(N)}$ are mutually independent because the samples $x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(N)}$ are i.i.d. random vectors. By writing the members of the sequence in the form

$$x_i^{(n)} e^{-\|\boldsymbol{\xi} - \mathbf{x}^{(n)}\|_2^2 / 2\nu^2} x_j^{(n)}$$

we can see that are also identically distributed. By Lemma 2, the terms have finite means.

Thus, by the strong law of large numbers, the sample averages $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N x_i^{(n)} w_{nn} x_j^{(n)} + \delta_{i=j}$ converge to $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\xi}, \mathbf{1}_D)} [x_i e^{-\|\boldsymbol{\xi} - \mathbf{x}\|_2^2 / 2\nu^2} x_j]$ almost everywhere. This means that the ridge adjustment vanishes (converges to a null matrix). Likewise, the averages $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N x_i^{(n)} w_{nn} x_j^{(n)}$ converge to the same value $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\xi}, \mathbf{1}_D)} [x_i e^{-\|\boldsymbol{\xi} - \mathbf{x}\|_2^2 / 2\nu^2} x_j]$ almost everywhere. Thus, in the large sample limit, $\hat{\Sigma}$ and $\hat{\Gamma}$ converge to the same matrix. **It follows that, in the large sample limit, $\hat{\Sigma}^{-1}$ and $\hat{\Gamma}$ cancel each other, and so we expect that $\hat{\mathbf{u}} \rightarrow \boldsymbol{\beta}$.** That is, $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is recovered by the regression in spite of the ridge penalty and sample weighting.

Lemma 2. $x_i^{(n)} w_{nn} x_j^{(n)}$ has a finite mean for all i, j, n .

Proof. Fix some i, j, n . Since a random variable having finite variance implies that it has a finite mean, it is sufficient to show that $x_i^{(n)} w_{nn} x_j^{(n)}$ has a finite variance. We do this using the fact that, for dependent random variables A and B

$$\text{Var}(AB) \leq 2\text{Var}(A)\|B\|_\infty^2 + 2(\mathbb{E}[A])^2\text{Var}(B) \quad (8)$$

When using this inequality, we set $A := x_i^{(n)} x_j^{(n)}$ and $B := w_{nn}$.

We will establish that each term on the RHS of Equation 8 is finite in order to show that $\text{Var}(AB)$ is finite. To see that $\text{Var}(A)$ is finite, note that $x_i^{(n)} x_j^{(n)}$ are Chi-square random variables with 1 degree of freedom, which have finite variance. The weights $B = w_{nn}$ are bounded in the interval $(0, 1]$, so $\|B\|_\infty^2$ is finite. Chi-square random variables have finite means, so $\mathbb{E}[A]$ is finite. To see that $\text{Var}(B)$ is finite, note again that B is bounded in $(0, 1]$. Then $\mathbb{E}[B] \leq 1$. As B is bounded, B^2 is also bounded. Hence, the variance $\text{Var}(B) = \mathbb{E}[B^2] - \mathbb{E}[B]^2$ is a subtraction of finite quantities and therefore also finite. Evidently, each term in the RHS of Equation 8 is finite, and so $x_i^{(n)} w_{nn} x_j^{(n)}$ has a finite variance. It follows that the mean of $x_i^{(n)} w_{nn} x_j^{(n)}$ is also finite. \square

Lemma 3. Under the assumptions of Theorem 1, and given a random design matrix $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times D}$,

$$\|(\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{X} + \mathbf{I})^{-1} \mathbf{X} \mathbf{W} \mathbf{X}\|_2 \in O\left(\frac{1}{\sigma_{\min}(\mathbf{W})^D}\right)$$

Proof. For the sake of brevity we will define $\mathbf{A} := \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{X}$ and $\mathbf{B} := \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{I}$. To bound $\|\mathbf{B}\mathbf{A}\|_2$, we will begin by bounding $\|\mathbf{B}\|$. We employ the following upper bound for the norm of a $D \times D$ matrix's inverse. We use the notation $\sigma_k(\cdot)$ for the k th singular value of a matrix and $\sigma_{\min}(\cdot)$ and $\sigma_{\max}(\cdot)$ for the minimum and maximum singular values, respectively.

$$\|\mathbf{B}\|^{-1} \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{B}\|^{D-1}}{|\det(\mathbf{B})|}$$

Moreover,

$$\frac{\|\mathbf{B}\|^{D-1}}{|\det(\mathbf{B})|} \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{A}\|^{D-1} + 1}{|\det(\mathbf{B})|} = \frac{\|\mathbf{A}\|^{D-1} + 1}{\prod_k \sigma_k(\mathbf{B})} \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{A}\|^{D-1} + 1}{\sigma_{\min}(\mathbf{B})^D} \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{A}\|^{D-1} + 1}{(\sigma_{\min}(\mathbf{A}) + 1)^D}$$

The first inequality follows by Cauchy-Schwarz and the facts that $D > 1$ and power functions are monotonic. The last inequality follows from the fact that \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{I} are real and symmetric. Now, since the spectral norm $\|\cdot\|_2$ is bounded above by the spectral radius, after applying Cauchy-Schwarz and bounding the denominator we obtain that

$$\frac{\|\mathbf{A}\|^{D-1} + 1}{(\sigma_{\min}(\mathbf{A}) + 1)^D} \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{X}^T\|^{D-1} \|\mathbf{W}\|^{D-1} \|\mathbf{X}\|^{D-1} + 1}{\sigma_{\min}(\mathbf{A})^D} \leq \frac{\sigma_{\max}(\mathbf{X}^T)^{D-1} \sigma_{\max}(\mathbf{W})^{D-1} \sigma_{\max}(\mathbf{X})^{D-1} + 1}{\sigma_{\min}(\mathbf{A})^D}$$

We can now bound $\|\mathbf{B}^{-1} \mathbf{A}\|$ using Cauchy-Schwarz as follows.

$$\|\mathbf{B}^{-1} \mathbf{A}\| \leq \frac{\sigma_{\max}(\mathbf{X}^T)^D \sigma_{\max}(\mathbf{W})^D \sigma_{\max}(\mathbf{X})^D + \sigma_{\max}(\mathbf{X}^T) \sigma_{\max}(\mathbf{W}) \sigma_{\max}(\mathbf{X})}{\sigma_{\min}(\mathbf{X}^T)^D \sigma_{\min}(\mathbf{W})^D \sigma_{\min}(\mathbf{X})^D}$$

Now, since $0 < w_{nn} \leq 1$ for all $n = 1, \dots, N$, and since singular values are invariant under transposition, we can give the following upper bound which should be viewed as a function of $\sigma_{\min}(\mathbf{W})$ since we assumed that \mathbf{X} is fixed.

$$\|\mathbf{B}^{-1} \mathbf{A}\| \leq \left(\frac{\sigma_{\max}(\mathbf{X})^{2D} + \sigma_{\max}(\mathbf{X})^2}{\sigma_{\min}(\mathbf{X})^{2D}} \right) \frac{1}{\sigma_{\min}(\mathbf{W})^D}$$

Remark 2 (Connection to condition numbers). $\|\mathbf{B}^{-1} \mathbf{A}\|$ may be made larger when \mathbf{W} is ill-conditioned.

Recall that the condition number $\kappa(\cdot) \geq 1$ induced by the spectral norm of a matrix is the ratio of its largest and smallest singular values. The bound of Lemma 3 can be written in terms of condition numbers. By writing it in this form, it can be inferred that $\|\mathbf{B}^{-1} \mathbf{A}\|$ is made larger when \mathbf{W} is ill-conditioned.

$$\|\mathbf{B}^{-1} \mathbf{A}\| \leq \left(\kappa(\mathbf{X})^{2D} + \frac{\kappa(\mathbf{X})^2}{\sigma_{\min}(\mathbf{X})^{2D-2}} \right) \kappa(\mathbf{W})^D$$

The ill-conditioning of \mathbf{W} occurs when \mathbf{W} is close to being singular, which can happen when ν is near 0 since this would cause all entries of \mathbf{W} to be either 0 or close to it.

7.6 Details on Remark 1

Remark 1 suggested that, fixing a design matrix \mathbf{X} consisting of N samples, then if 1) ν is too small then each of the coefficients of $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$ will be near 0 and 2) making ν very large may yield a better approximation of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$. Both of these statements have to do with the construction of the weight matrix \mathbf{W} using a given \mathbf{X} .

Recalling that $\hat{\mathbf{u}} = (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{X} + \mathbf{I})^{-1} \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{X} \boldsymbol{\beta}$ and that, by Theorem 1 $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$ tends to $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ in the large sample limit, we can infer that it is desirable for $(\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{X} + \mathbf{I})^{-1} \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{X}$ to be near the identity matrix and, therefore, to have norm 1. Lemma 3 gives an upper bound on $\|(\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{X} + \mathbf{I})^{-1} \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{X}\|$, so we can use it to investigate what makes this upper bound large. By analyzing $\|(\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{X} + \mathbf{I})^{-1} \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{X}\|$, we can get a rough estimate of how much $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is distorted.

We can deduce from the bound given in Lemma 3 that setting ν too small makes it possible for $\|\mathbf{B}^{-1} \mathbf{A}\|$ to be large. This is because $\sigma_{\min}(\mathbf{W})$ is just $\min_{n=1, \dots, N} w_{nn} = \min_{n=1, \dots, N} e^{-\|x^{(n)} - \boldsymbol{\xi}\|_2^2 / 2\nu^2}$ and smaller ν increases the decay rate of the w_{nn} , leading to $\frac{1}{\sigma_{\min}(\mathbf{W})^D}$ being very large. On the other hand, since in the context of Lemma 3 \mathbf{X} is fixed, larger values of ν make $\frac{1}{\sigma_{\min}(\mathbf{W})^D}$ closer to 1 and therefore lead to smaller upper bounds for $\|\mathbf{B}^{-1} \mathbf{A}\|$.

To see this more concretely, suppose that a random design matrix \mathbf{X} with rows sampled from $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}_D, \mathbf{I}_{D \times D})$ is fixed. Furthermore, assume that each row has $\|\mathbf{x}^{(n)}\| \leq 1$. Then, we can use the anti-concentration of the norms of the rows $\mathbf{x}^{(n)}$ to show that when ν is too small, all values in \mathbf{W} will be smaller than a value $\epsilon > 0$. Simple computations show that $w_{nn} < \epsilon$ when $\|\mathbf{x}^{(n)}\| > t := \sqrt{2} \sqrt{-\log(\epsilon)/\nu^2}$. If we assume that $t \leq \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{x}\|^{(n)}]$, and by extension impose the restriction $\nu \geq \sqrt{2} \sqrt{-\log(\epsilon)/D}$, we may use an application of the Azuma-Hoeffding inequality (Hoeffding 1994) to estimate the probability that $\|\mathbf{x}^{(n)}\|$ is sufficiently large that $w_{nn} < \epsilon$.

$$\mathbb{P}[\|\mathbf{x}^{(n)}\| > t] \geq 1 - \frac{1}{2D} \exp\left(-2\sqrt{2} \sqrt{-\log(\epsilon)/\nu^2} - 2\sqrt{D}\right)$$

If, for example $D = 100$, $\epsilon = \frac{1}{1000}$, and ν takes on the smallest value for the inequality to be used (about .38), then $\mathbb{P}[\|\mathbf{x}^{(n)}\| > t] = 1$. That is, $w_{nn} < \epsilon$ almost surely.

Insights From Theoretical Results

- Although explanations using discretized features may be more easily interpretable, they make the explanations less data-aligned
- Users should generally opt to set N to be large
- Users should generally set ν to be large, otherwise the LIME coefficients may become zero
- The ridge penalty matters only when $\lambda \in O(N)$

Simulation Experiments

We provide simulations to test the assertions of Theorem 1 and Remark 1 experimentally. We adopt the settings of Theorem 1 and experimentally test the roles of N , ν on the convergence of weighted ridge regression using LIME’s exponential kernel and the ridge penalty set to $\Delta = 1$.

Role of ν and N on convergence We give empirical confirmation of the assertions of our theoretical results and show the experimental results in Figure 16. To do this, we create ten random design matrices \mathbf{X} for each combination of $N = 10, 100, 1000, 10000, 100000$ rows and $D = 5, 10, 100$ columns. For each of these matrices, we compute $\|\mathbf{B}^{-1}\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{I}\|$ using each of $\nu = .1, 1, 10, 10000$. We report the mean value of $\|\mathbf{B}^{-1}\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{I}\|$ as N is varied.

Figure 16 is a log-log plot of dimension versus the distance $\|\mathbf{B}^{-1}\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{I}\|$. It shows that small ν leads to slower convergence and larger ν leads to faster convergence. It also shows that increasing N generally leads to $\|\mathbf{B}^{-1}\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{I}\|$ being smaller. That the curves are approximately linear indicates the presence of a power law relationship. These results constitute supporting evidence for our claim that ν and N should be set to large values. In particular, it is advantageous to set them to be larger than their defaults of $\nu = .75\sqrt{D}$ and $N = 1000$.




Figure 16: Log-log plot of the how ν, N influence $\|\mathbf{B}^{-1}\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{I}\|$.

Appendix B: Details on Mitigation Strategies

This section contains the details for the hypothesis testing framework we use to evaluate our mitigation strategies, as well as additional mitigation strategies. We motivate each test used and give the statements of the null and alternative hypotheses. Two more mitigation strategies involving ensembles of explainers are presented.

7.6.1 Hypothesis Testing for Improvement

In this section, we will describe our hypothesis testing framework for improvement of data-alignment. We will abuse notation here and, for example, consider \mathcal{E} to be LIME with default settings explaining an NN \mathcal{M}_1 and \mathcal{E}' to be an explanation method that applies

some mitigation strategies we propose. Thus, the notation \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{E}' suppresses the models and data being used.

Wilcoxon signed-rank tests are non-parametric tests for differences of populations, and thus applicable in our setting. Given two sets of measurements $A = \{a_i\}_{i=1}^m$ and $B = \{b_i\}_{i=1}^m$, Wilcoxon signed-rank tests operate on the matched differences $a_i - b_i$. We can view explanations from \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{E}' as a matched sample since, for each i , $e_{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{x}^{(i)})$ and $e_{\mathcal{E}'}(\mathbf{x}^{(i)})$ differ only by the explanation method used. We will assume that the differences are symmetrically distributed so that the null hypotheses declare the location of the population mean of the differences $a_i - b_i$. All tests will be performed with a significance level of $\alpha = .05$.

Our use of Wilcoxon signed-rank tests is not exactly the same for all three metrics, but follows the following general framework in each case. Given a metric m , the null hypothesis $H_{0,\delta}$ asserts that \mathcal{E}' and \mathcal{E} are the same on average with respect to the metric m along a dimension δ . If m is directionality, then δ ranges over the feature indices $j = 1, \dots, D$. If m is concordance, the notion of δ is irrelevant. If m is relevance, δ ranges over $k = 1, \dots, D - 1$.

$H_{0,\delta}$: The $m_{\delta}(e_{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}, \boldsymbol{\beta})) - m_{\delta}(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}, \boldsymbol{\beta}))$ are symmetric about $\mu = 0$

$H_{1,\delta}$ asserts that \mathcal{E}' is significantly worse than \mathcal{E} along dimension δ .

$H_{1,\delta}$: The $m_{\delta}(e_{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}, \boldsymbol{\beta})) - m_{\delta}(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}, \boldsymbol{\beta}))$ are symmetric about $\mu > 0$

If we reject $H_{0,\delta}$ in favor of $H_{1,\delta}$ at the $\alpha = .05$ level for at least one δ , we come to the conclusion that \mathcal{E}' did not improve over \mathcal{E} with respect to m . Otherwise, and if $H_{0,\delta}$ is rejected in favor of the following $H_{2,\delta}$ for at least one δ , we conclude that \mathcal{E}' constitutes an improvement over \mathcal{E} with respect to m .

$H_{2,\delta}$: The $m_{\delta}(e_{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}, \boldsymbol{\beta})) - m_{\delta}(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}, \boldsymbol{\beta}))$ are symmetric about $\mu < 0$

When applying this framework to directionality, the differences are $s_j(e_{\mathcal{E}}(x_j^{(i)}, \beta_j)) - s_j(e_{\mathcal{E}'}(x_j^{(i)}, \beta_j))$. When applying this framework to concordance, $\delta = 1$, the differences are $\text{concordance}(e_{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}, \boldsymbol{\beta})) - \text{concordance}(e_{\mathcal{E}'}(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}))$, and $H_{1,1}$ is unused. When applying the framework to relevance the differences are $\text{relevance}_k(r(e_{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}), r(\boldsymbol{\beta}))) - \text{relevance}_k(r(e_{\mathcal{E}'}(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}), r(\boldsymbol{\beta})))$.

7.7 Additional Mitigation Strategies

In this section, we provide the results for mitigations strategies that we tried that are less effective or less intuitive/natural than those in the main paper. In particular, we explore two additional ways to use ensembles of explanations. They are both ways to aggregate explanations of a single model.

We propose that the primary reason these strategies did not work well is that the SHAP and LIME explanations do not satisfy the necessary criteria for the success of ensemble algorithms. Viewed as means for predicting the ranking of features with respect to their marginal effects, SHAP and LIME are neither weak nor strong classifiers. So, even though the simplicity of our aggregation techniques plays a role in the quality of our results, even if we were to develop a more sophisticated boost, bagging, or stacking method, the SHAP and LIME explanations would not satisfy the requirements necessary for those algorithms to work.

7.7.1 Averaging SHAP and LIME Explanations

A simple way to resolve the difficulty in choosing whether to use SHAP or LIME is to use both and combine their results. Since SHAP and LIME have differing meanings of feature importance it does not make sense to aggregate them without further processing. We take two steps to address this. First, we normalize the Shapley values (following Section 5.3.1) so that both SHAP and LIME can be seen as approximating the marginal effects β . Then we max-normalized the SHAP and LIME values so that they occur on the same scale.

Figure 17 displays a comparison between LIME, SHAP, and their average with respect to data-alignment. Figure 17a shows that, generally, at least one of LIME or SHAP has higher (or equal) directionality than their average for each feature. Figure 17b shows that the mean concordances for LIME, SHAP, and their average are nearly equal. Figure 17c shows that relevance for the average is better than SHAP generally, better than LIME for $k = 1$, and otherwise equal. Thus, this averaging scheme is evidently not significantly effective for increasing data-alignment.




Figure 17: Comparison of individual LIME and (normalized) SHAP explanations with explanations constructed by averaging the feature importance values between the two for each applicant

7.7.2 Voting Ensembles

Prior experiments handled ensembles of explanations by constructing the final ranking by ranking the features according to the average importance given to them over the component explanations. We hypothesized that this strategy could be improved by adding sophistication using voting strategies such as the Borda count.

The Borda count is a ranked choice voting method. In it, every voter provides a ranking of the candidates. Each candidate is allocated a number of points from every ballot depending on what rank they were assigned. The point assignment method varies, but in the original formulation (which is used by the Slovenian Parliament), every candidate gets at least one point from each ballot. If there are C candidates, then each voter gives their top ranked

candidate C points, gives their runner-up $C - 1$ points, and so on until they give their lowest ranked candidate 1 point. The candidate with the most total points wins the election.

The Borda count can be used to produce feature rankings for an input from LIME by making many LIME explainers (by varying its hyperparameters) and considering each LIME explainer to be a voter. We tested this method by comparing single explanations for each applicant with explanations formed from the Borda count results of 100 LIME explainers with random seeds $1, 2, \dots, 100$.

We show the results of our experiment for concordance and relevance metrics in Figure 18 (since the Borda count operates on rankings, it is not possible to compute directionality). Overall, our experiment did not provide evidence that the Borda count is an effective way to aggregate feature rankings. In fact, the concordance of rankings constructed via the Borda count were strictly worse than those from the individual LIME explanations; Figure 18a shows that the mean concordance of the rankings constructed via Borda count is less than half of that of the individual LIME rankings.




Figure 18: Comparisons of results for our three metrics for rankings from one LIME explainer compared with rankings obtained by applying the Borda count to rankings from 100 LIME explainers.

Appendix C: Data for Econometric Case Study

The meaning and ranges of each feature of the dataset are provided below in Table 3. The meanings of the feature names were obtained (Hunter and Walker 1996a).

FEATURE	MEANING	RANGE
good credit	credit history meets guidelines	binary
purchaser type	type of purchaser of loan	0,1,2,...,9
PMI approved	approved for private mortgage insurance (PMI)	binary
multi family	purchasing 2-4 family home versus 1 family home or condo	binary
unver	unverifiable info	binary
fixed rate	fixed or adjustable rate	binary
bankruptcy	filed bankruptcy	binary
value rate	whether the rental income in tract divided by estimate of value of rental property > Boston median	binary
debt rate	percentages of housing expenditures and other obligations normalized by total income	[0,100]
old	applicant age > Boston median	binary
married	if applicant married	binary
gift	gift as down payment	binary

Table 3: Feature meanings and ranges for the case study

Appendix D: Repetition of Main Experiments on Another Dataset

To further support our findings, repeat the experiments in Section 5.3 using a synthetic direct marketing example. The meanings of the features and how they were generated is summarized in Table 4. Unlike the loan application dataset used in the main body of the paper, this direct marketing dataset contains categorical features. We binarize the categorical features, which contributes to this dataset having more features than the loan application dataset (16 versus 10).

7.7.3 Baseline

Figure 19 shows a comparison between SHAP and LIME with their default settings and a random explainer when explaining a model with test set ROC AUC of .93 that was trained on the marketing dataset described in Table 4. We reach the same conclusion as in Section 5, that is that LIME does fairly well with respect to all three metrics while SHAP is not significantly better than a random explainer except with respect to relevance.

FEATURE	EXPLANATION	FORMULA
Age	Customer Age	Uniform(18,100)
Sex	Customer Sex	Bernoulli(.5)
Married	Customer Marital Status	Bernoulli(.5)
Education	Customer Education Level	High School, College, or Graduate
Previous Purchase	Whether product previously purchased	Bernoulli(.5)
Website Visits	Number of Times Website Visited	Uniform(0,50)
Subscribed	Subscribed to Regular Ads	Bernoulli(.5)
Offer Type	Type of offer in Ad	Discount, BOGO, or Free Shipping
Offer Value	Value of offer in Ad	Depends on Subscription status
Mode	Way advertisement is delivered	Email, SMS, or Social Media

Table 4: Description of features for simulated direct marketing data.




Figure 19: Bar plot of directionality, violin plot of concordance, and line plot for relevance_k . For plot (c) each point in the line plot represents a mean relevance for a given k . The error bars represent the standard error. The total number of features is 16.

7.7.4 SHAP Normalization

As in Section 5.3.1, we check whether SHAP normalization is useful when working with the direct marketing dataset. Figure 20 shows that this is indeed the case if not only because concordance increased greatly. Additionally, directionality for many features increased from nearly .5 to nearly 1.




Figure 20: Comparison of SHAP explanations without and with SHAP value normalization


7.7.5 Role of Predictive Performance of \mathcal{M}

To test the effect of the predictive performance of \mathcal{M} , we compare explanations of models \mathcal{M}_1 with AUC .68, \mathcal{M}_2 with AUC .93, and \mathcal{M}_3 with AUC .99. The results of our comparison, illustrated below in Figure 21, show that although directionality was not significantly impacted for SHAP or LIME, increasing the model AUC had substantial effects on concordance and relevance.


7.7.6 Role of Feature Independence

Following Section 5.3.3, we modify the direct marketing dataset to make the features independent but do not change the formula for $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{X})$. The only change made is to change “Offer Value” from being a function of subscription status to becoming uniformly distributed between 5 and 50 dollars.


It was again the case that explanations of the model trained on data with independent features were more data aligned. In particular, Figure 22 shows that explanations of the model trained on the version of the marketing dataset with independent features had a mean concordance which was about .1 larger and relevance_k for $k = 2, 3, 4$ which were up to .5 larger.




(a) SHAP Directionality




(b) SHAP Concordance




(c) SHAP Relevance



(d) LIME Directionality



(e) LIME Concordance



(f) LIME Relevance

Figure 21: Comparisons of results for our three metrics for SHAP and LIME when explaining \mathcal{M}_1 with AUC=.6, \mathcal{M}_2 with AUC=0.92, and \mathcal{M}_3 with AUC=.99




Figure 22: Comparison of faithfulness of explanations of models trained on data with independent features versus data with two strongly correlated features.