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ABSTRACT

Tabular data is one of the most common data storage formats in business applications, ranging from retail, bank and E-commerce. These applications rely heavily on machine learning models to achieve business success. One of the critical problems in learning tabular data is to distinguish influential features from all the predetermined features. Global feature selection has been well-studied for quite some time, assuming that all instances have the same influential feature subsets. However, different instances rely on different feature subsets in practice, which also gives rise to the instance-wise feature selection receiving increasing attention in recent studies. In this paper, we first propose a novel method for discovering instance-wise influential features for tabular data (DIWIFT), the core of which is to introduce the influence function to measure the importance of an instance-wise feature. DIWIFT is capable of automatically discovering influential feature subsets of different sizes in different instances, which is different from global feature selection that considers all instances with the same influential feature subset. On the other hand, different from the previous instance-wise feature selection, DIWIFT minimizes the validation loss on the validation set and is thus more robust to the distribution shift existing in the training and test dataset, which is important in tabular data. Finally, we conduct extensive experiments on both synthetic and real-world datasets to validate the effectiveness of our DIWIFT, compared with baseline methods. Moreover, we also demonstrate the robustness of our method via some ablation experiments.

CCS CONCEPTS

• Computing methodologies → Feature selection; • Information systems → Data mining.

*Equal contribution

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

ACM Reference Format:

1 INTRODUCTION

Tabular data is one of the most common data formats in commercial applications, such as E-commerce recommendation [27], fraud detection [4], and anomaly detection [17]. Unlike homogeneous data such as image, text or speech data, which usually have strong spatial, semantic or temporal correlation, tabular data is often heterogeneous, and the correlation between different columns (or fields) is weak. We give an example of the UCI-bank1 dataset in Table 1, where “age (n)” is “education (c)” is two distinct columns and the correlation between them is ambiguous. Obviously, this property makes it much harder to get good results from tabular data via machine learning than from otherwise homogeneous data.

Table 1: An example of tabular data from UCI-Bank. The letters in the parentheses indicate the feature types, where ’n’ for numerical dense feature and ’c’ for categorical sparse feature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>age (n)</th>
<th>job (c)</th>
<th>marital (c)</th>
<th>education (c)</th>
<th>balance (n)</th>
<th>housing (c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>unemployed</td>
<td>married</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>1787</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>services</td>
<td>married</td>
<td>secondary</td>
<td>4789</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>management</td>
<td>single</td>
<td>tertiary</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>blue-collar</td>
<td>married</td>
<td>secondary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>management</td>
<td>single</td>
<td>tertiary</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In tabular data, each row corresponds to an instance and each column corresponds to a field. The value in a cell of the table, i.e., the value of a field of a data instance, is referred to as a feature.

1https://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml/datasets/bank+marketing
Usually, in addition to the columns for the fields, there is also a column for the label of each data instance in supervised tasks, which may indicate whether the instance is a positive or negative sample of a certain class. An important way to achieve more effective learning from tabular data is feature selection. Firstly, tabular data often have many dense numerical features and high-dimensional sparse features, which consume a significant amount of resources during the training and inference phases of machine learning. Feeding a selection of the most influential features into machine learning models can greatly reduce the costs. Secondly, because of the weak correlation between features in tabular data, there usually exist irrelevant or redundant features. Removing non-influential (i.e., irrelevant and redundant) features makes machine learning models more effective. Finally, some applications require model interpretation. For example, when using AI models to assist the decision of credit card approvals, it is desirable for the model to provide the key factors that influence the decision. Identifying the most influential features helps identify the importance of features and enhances the interpretability of the results.

In the industry, enormous workloads have been devoted to manual feature engineering to identify the most influential subset of features in tabular data. To reduce the manual work, existing work [7] on feature selection has focused on field-wise selection, i.e., the granularity of selection is a whole column of the table, where selected features are the same for every data instance. However, field-wise feature selection has a significant deficiency because the features affecting the labels may vary substantially in different data instances. For example, in recommender systems, different users may choose particular items due to very different factors (i.e., features) such as price, quality, color, and functionality. As a result, field-wise feature selection causes poor performance, and it is compelling to allow the selection of different features for different data instances, i.e., instance-wise feature selection.

Instance-wise feature selection method instead tries to discover influential features subset for each instance. Specifically, feature selection in tabular data is on the row level, and then selects several columns that are more relevant to the current row. There are some related works [3, 15, 25] about instance-wise feature selection that have been proposed, but most of them focus on homogeneous data instead of tabular data. TabNet [1] considers how to select features to improve model performance in training distribution while ignoring the robustness of the subset of features. In this paper, different from the existing work, our goal is to customize a new instance-wise feature selection method that focuses on tabular data, and this method can be more robust under distribution shifts.

As a response, we propose a novel method for discovering instance-wise influential features for tabular data (DIWIFT), in which the influence function is introduced to measure the importance of an instance-wise feature. Specifically, we first utilize the influence function (IF) to measure the influence of each feature on the loss of validation set, and provide theoretical insights into why and how the instance-wise feature selection can promote the model performance. Then, based on the above theoretical insights, we design an instance-wise feature selection framework that uses the self-attention mechanism [21] to obtain the feature selection probability and regards the sum of the IF of selected features as the optimization target.

The contributions of this paper are summarized as follows:

- We propose a novel method, DIWIFT, which is capable to automate discovering influential feature subsets of different sizes in different instances.
- Compared with previous instance-wise feature selection methods, DIWIFT expands the applicable scenarios to heterogeneous tabular data instead of homogeneous data (e.g. image and language data) studied by previous work, and can perform more robust to distribution shift via considering more information about the validation set.
- We conduct extensive experiments both on synthetic and real-world datasets to validate the effectiveness of our DIWIFT, and show significant improvements over the state-of-the-art methods.

2 RELATED WORK

In this section, we briefly review some related works on three research topics, including tabular data modeling, feature selection and influence function.

2.1 Tabular Data Modeling

Tabular data is one of the most common data formats used in web applications [2]. Current research on tabular data can be classified into two classes. One class focuses on how to model the tabular data effectively [1, 9, 14]. [14] proposed network on network modeling for heterogeneous tabular data instead of homogeneous data (e.g. image and language data) studied by previous work, and can perform more robust to distribution shift via considering more information about the validation set.

Another class of research is feature interaction [13, 24], which is also an important factor in modeling tabular data. TabNet [1] considers how to select features to improve model performance in training distribution while ignoring the robustness of the subset of features. In this paper, different from the existing work, our goal is to customize a new instance-wise feature selection method that focuses on tabular data, and this method can be more robust under distribution shifts.

2.2 Feature Selection

Feature selection refers to discovering a subset of features based on their usefulness. [7] proposed a global method, which attributes feature importance based on entire training data. Instance-wise feature selection has been investigated in homogeneous data. L2X [3] focuses on instance-wise feature selection as a specific approach for model interpretation. CL2X [16] formulates a causal extension to L2X. The limitation of both L2X and CL2X is that they are only capable of discovering fix number of relevant features for each instance. INVASE [25] is a work which overcomes this limitation. They propose a method named INVASE via minimizing a Kullback-Leibler divergence between the full conditional distribution and the selected-features-only conditional distribution of the outcome. TabNet [1] studies how to select features from tabular data in training distribution. However, all of the three previous works only validate their
effectiveness on homogeneous data, and do not consider the distribution shift between the training set and test set.

2.3 Influence Function

Influence function (IF) is an important concept within the scope of robust statistics and defined by Gâteaux derivatives [8], and can be extended to measure instance-wise influence [11, 19, 23, 26] and feature-wise influence [20] on validation loss. [11] uses IF to design adversarial examples and explain the behavior of the black-box model. [22, 23] build important instance sampling schema based on IF. [19, 26] learn to reweight the loss of training instance via minimizing the loss of unbiased clean validation set, which can make deep learning more robust and unbiased. [20] studies the properties of the empirical risk minimization can be estimated where

\[
\hat{\Theta} \triangleq \arg \min_{\Theta} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} R(x_i, \Theta),
\]

where \( \Theta \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d} \) is a model parameter, \( \mathcal{X} = X_1 \times \cdots \times X_d \) is the \( d \)-dimensional feature space, and \( \mathcal{Y} \) is the discrete label space which is \( \{0, 1\} \) in binary classification and \( \{0, 1, \ldots, c\} \) in multi-class classification. A prediction model is trained on the given training instances \( \{z_i\}_{i=1}^{n} \) via minimizing the empirical risk, \( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} l(z_i, \theta) \), where \( \theta \in \Theta \) is a model parameter, \( l(z_i, \theta) \) is a loss function. To simplify the notation, we omit the regularization term in loss in our theoretical analysis, and this will not affect the result of our work. Therefore, the empirical risk minimization can be estimated by \( \hat{\theta} \triangleq \arg \min_{\Theta} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} l(z_i, \theta) \). For ease of reference, the main notations in this paper are listed in Table 2.

### Table 2: Main notations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( z_i, z_j )</td>
<td>( i )-th training and ( j )-th validation instance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( i, j, k )</td>
<td>Index of training instance, validation instance, and feature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n, m, d )</td>
<td>Size of training set, evaluation set, and feature dimension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \delta_i, \delta_{ik} )</td>
<td>Perturbation put on features of ( z_i ), ( \delta_i \in \mathbb{R}^d ), ( \delta_{ik} \in \mathbb{R} ).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( S, S_{ik} )</td>
<td>Feature selection matrix and its element for training set, ( S \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d} ), ( S_{ik} \in \mathbb{R} ).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \hat{\theta}, \theta )</td>
<td>Parameter of base model network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \hat{\omega}, \omega )</td>
<td>Parameter of self-attention network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \phi(z_i, z_j) )</td>
<td>Influence function of ( z_i ) on ( z_j ), ( \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times d} ).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \phi_{ik}, \phi_{ik} )</td>
<td>Influence function of ( z_i ) on the whole validation set, ( \phi_{ik} \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times d} ), ( \phi_{ik} \in \mathbb{R} ).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( l(\cdot) )</td>
<td>Loss of base model, ( \in \mathbb{R} ).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( P(x, y) )</td>
<td>Training distribution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( Q(x, y) )</td>
<td>Validation distribution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1 Feature Selection Matrix in Training Data

Unlike the traditionally global feature selection which selects the same feature subset for all the instances, we consider a more practical case that different features rely on different subsets of the features, then aim to do instance-wise feature selection to improve the model performance. We refer to \( S \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times d} \) as the feature selection matrix for the training set, where \( S_{ik} \equiv 1 \) indicates that feature \( k (1 \leq k \leq d) \) is selected in instance \( z_i \), and \( S_{ik} = 0 \) indicates that feature \( k \) is not selected in instance \( z_i \).

Note that, the feature dimension \( d \) in the tabular data is always much larger than the column (field) number of the tabular data. And the high-dimensional sparse tabular data is usually one-hot encoded, so only one of the features in the same field appears in a column, which indicates that the appeared feature is encoded as one, otherwise zero. In this case, if feature \( k \) has zero value in instance \( z_i \), it’s impossible to select this feature. Then it’s reasonable that we still use \( S_{ik} = 0 \) to denote the zero value case in one-hot data.

To sum up, the meaning of \( S \) is:

\[
S_{ik} = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if feature } k \text{ is selected in } z_i \\
0 & \text{if feature } k \text{ is not selected or is zero in } z_i 
\end{cases}
\]  

3.2 Definition of Influence Function

How to measure the influence of a feature in model performance is the key question in feature selection. In this paper, we utilize the influence function (IF) to handle it.

If a training instance \( z_i \) is perturbed to \( \hat{z}_i = (x_i + \delta_i, y_i) \), and let \( \hat{\theta}_{\delta_i} \) be the empirical risk minimizer after \( z_i \) is perturbed to \( \hat{z}_i \). Then the influence of the perturbation on the loss at a validation instance \( z_j \) has a closed-form expression [11]:

\[
\phi(z_i, z_j) \triangleq \frac{d l(\hat{z}_j, \hat{\theta}_{\delta_i})}{d \delta_i} |_{\delta_i = 0} = -\nabla_{\theta_l} l(z_i, \hat{\theta})^T H_{\hat{\theta}}^{-1} \nabla_{\theta_l} l(z_i, \hat{\theta}),
\]

where \( \phi(z_i, z_j) \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times d} \) is the feature-level IF of \( z_i \) over \( z_j \), \( z_j \) is a validation instance draw from validation distribution \( Q(x, y) \), and \( H_{\hat{\theta}} \equiv \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \nabla_{\theta_l}^2 l(z_i, \hat{\theta}) \) is the Hessian matrix and is positive definite.

In contrast with the feature-level IF defined in Eq. (2), there also exists an instance-level IF that measures the influence of weight updating a training instance. While the instance-level IF has been studied much more in many previous papers that study instance subsampling or instance reweighting [19, 23, 26], the feature-level IF is rarely studied.

4 METHOD

In this section, we firstly discuss why the instance-wise feature selection can improve the performance and how to discover instance-wise influential features with the help of the influence function, then we propose the DIWIFT method to realize the instance-wise feature selection, and elaborate on the details of the implementation of DIWIFT at last.
4.1 Relating Influence Function to Instance-wise Feature Selection

According to the definition of IF in Eq. (2), we can approximate the loss change of \( z_j - Q(x, y) \) if \( z_j \sim P(x, y) \) is perturbed by \( \delta_j \in \mathbb{R}^d \):

\[
\Delta_l(z_j, \hat{\theta}_k) - \Delta_l(z_j, \hat{\theta}) \approx \phi(z_j, z_j)\delta_j, \tag{3}
\]

which can be extended to the whole validation set \( \mathcal{D} \) as follows:

\[
\Delta_l(z_j, \hat{\theta}_k) = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \Delta_l(z_j, \hat{\theta}) \approx \sum_{j=1}^{m} \phi(z_j, z_j)|\delta_j|, \tag{4}
\]

where \( m \) is the validation set size. Obviously, the best perturbation should minimize the validation loss \( \sum_{j=1}^{m} \Delta_l(z_j, \hat{\theta}_k) \), then we have the optimization problem about \( \delta_j \):

\[
\delta_j^* = \arg\min_{\delta_j} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \Delta_l(z_j, \hat{\theta}_k) = \arg\min_{\delta_j} \phi(z_j, z_j), \tag{5}
\]

where \( \phi_j = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \phi(z_j, z_j) \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times d} \) indicates the influence of instance \( z_j \) over the whole validation set.

Denote the \( k \)-th dimension of \( \phi_i \), \( \delta_i \) and \( x_j \) by \( \phi_{ik}, \delta_{ik} \) and \( x_{ik} \), respectively. For the adversarial training problem of image data in which the feature value is dense and continuous, the optimal \( \delta_{i,k} \) is in the direction of \( \phi_{ik} \) [11]. However, for the feature selection problem in tabular data, the value range of \( \delta_{ik} \) is \([0, -x_{ik}] \). \( \delta_{ik} = 0 \) means \( x_{ik} \) remains unchanged, while \( \delta_{ik} = -x_{ik} \) means \( x_{ik} \) is removed. Moreover, in tabular data, the one-hot encoded sparse feature value \( x_{ik} \) is in \([0, 1]\), and the normalized dense feature value \( x_{ik} \) is in [0, 1]. Thus, \( \delta_{ik} \leq 0 \) always holds, and the solution of Eq. (5) is

\[
\delta_{ik}^* = \begin{cases} 
0 & \text{if } \phi_{ik} < 0 \\
-x_{ik} & \text{if } \phi_{ik} \geq 0 
\end{cases}. \tag{6}
\]

The results in Eq. (6) is intuitive, since \( \phi_{ik} \geq 0 \) means the existence of \( x_{ik} \) can increase the validation loss, then we certainly should remove this feature. Recall the feature selection matrix \( S \) defined in Section 3, we can see that, if feature \( k \) in \( z_j \) is selected, i.e. \( S_{jk} = 1 \), two conditions should be satisfied: \( x_{ik} > 0 \) and \( \delta_{ik} = 0 \). Then we get the theoretically optimal \( S_{ik}^* \):

\[
S_{ik}^* = \mathbb{1}(\phi_{ik} x_{ik} < 0), \tag{7}
\]

where \( \mathbb{1}(\cdot) \) is the 0-1 indicator function.

Aiming to minimize the validation loss of the model trained after the instance-wise feature selection, we obtain the optimal instance-wise feature selection strategy in Eq. (7) with the help of the influence function. In [19, 26], they verify that minimizing the loss on the unbiased clean validation set can make deep learning more robust and unbiased. Thus our instance-wise feature selection method can also perform robustly in the scenarios where the training and test distribution exist distribution shift. To the best of our knowledge, all the previous feature selection work only consider how to make the model have better performance on the training distribution. Overall, our feature selection method could perform more robustly than the previous feature selection methods in theory, which is also verified in our experiment (see Section 5.7).

4.2 DIWIFT Method

Although we have obtained the optimal solution of \( S \) in Eq. (7), there is still a challenge. The analysis in Section 4.1 focuses on
the instance-wise feature selection for training instances during the training stage, and IF is needed for $S_{tr}^t$, but the validation instances also need feature selection during the inference stage. However, we cannot calculate IF for the validation instances according to the definition of IF. To better build the feature selection model for all instances, we utilize the self-attention mechanism [21] to propose the DIWIFT method. The overall framework of DIWIFT is illustrated in Figure 1.

As illustrated in Figure 1, the core processes in DIWIFT are: 1) Use the original tabular data which is without feature selection to training on the base network (denoted as $M_0$) to get the pre-trained model parameter $\hat{\theta}$. $\hat{\theta}$ is necessary for calculating IF as described in Eq. (2). In theory, $\hat{\theta}$ should be the parameter of the optimal empirical risk minimizer, however, we cannot get the accurate $\hat{\theta}$, since the deep learning model is non-convex. Thus, we study how sensitive the DIWIFT is when facing the fluctuation of the pre-trained model (see Section 5.8). 2) Train the feature selection model. Firstly, the original tabular data is fed into the feature selection model (denoted as $M_1$) which outputs the instance-wise feature selection probabilities. Secondly, the instances after feature selection and the pre-trained $\hat{\theta}$ are fed into the IF calculator to calculate IF. Thirdly, the calculated IF is used to compute the loss of feature selection designed in Eq. (13). Fourthly, the feature selection model $M_1$ is updated by the back-propagation. Note that, we adopt the self-attention-mechanism in our feature selection model to capture the importance of features driven by the influence function, but the self-attention-mechanism is not a necessary structure, and in fact, any neural network that generates a masking matrix with input dimension can be used in the feature selection model.

After the feature selection model $M_1$ in DIWIFT finishes training, the original instances will be fed into the feature selection model $M_1$ and the base network $M_0$ again to re-train the final base network. In the prediction stage, an instance will undergo instance-wise feature selection through the feature selection model, and then make predictions through the final base network on the instance after feature selection.

In the following, we will introduce these important components of DIWIFT in detail.

4.2.1 Feature selection model. As shown in Figure 1, we use self-attention mechanism [21] to effectively model the selected probability, because self-attention has been verified to be a useful module to capture the important features in an instance [18, 28]. Note that, the self-attention-mechanism is not a necessary structure, and any neural network that generates a masking matrix with input dimension can be used in our feature selection model.

In our method, we firstly get output from multi-head attention. Here, we define that

$$ Q = K = V = \begin{pmatrix} e_1 \\ e_2 \\ \vdots \\ e_i \\ \vdots \\ e_d \end{pmatrix}. $$

where $e_i$ denotes the embedding representation of $i$-th feature. And $Q = K = V \in R^{d \times K_d}$ where $K_d$ is the dimension of the output embeddings. Specifically, we define self-attention as

$$ \text{Attention}(Q, K, V) = \text{softmax}(\frac{QK^T}{\sqrt{K_d}}V), $$

where the query $Q$ the key $K$ and the value $V$ are the same. Furthermore, multihead self-attention is inferred as

$$ E = \text{Multihead}(Q, K, V) = \text{Concatenate}(\text{head}_1, \text{head}_2, \ldots, \text{head}_h)W^O, $$

where $h$ means the number of self-attention networks, $\text{head}_i = \text{Attention}(Q_i, K_i, V_i)$ and the parameters matrix $W^O \in R^{hK_d \times K_d}$.

Then feed it to a multi-layer perceptron (MLP) with $\text{ReLU}(x) = \max(0, x)$ activation function as

$$ f(x, \omega) = \text{MLP}(E). $$

Finally, the $f(x, \omega) : R^d \rightarrow R^d$ denotes mapping from the input feature vector to the output for short, where $\omega$ represents the parameters of the neural network. We design the probability of selecting each corresponding feature as

$$ p(x, \omega) = \sigma(f(x, \omega)/\tau), $$

where $p(x, \omega) \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\sigma(\cdot)$ is the sigmoid function, $\tau \in \mathbb{R}^+$ is the alterable temperature parameter. In this paper, we design $\tau = \max(\tau_{\text{min}}, 1 - (1 - \tau_{\text{min}})t/t_{\text{max}})$, where $\tau_{\text{min}}$ is the minimum temperature parameter which is small enough (e.g. 0.001), $t$ is the training epoch number, $t_{\text{max}}$ is the maximum epoch number. So with the increase of training epoch, $\tau$ gradually decreases to a small enough value which ensures the selection probability of a feature is close to 0 or 1.

The structure of our feature selection model in DIWIFT is shown in Figure 2.
Algorithm 1 Calculating influence function \( \phi_i(p(x, \omega)) \)

**Require:** The training set after feature reweighting \( \{ p_i \odot x_i, y_i \}_{i=1}^n \),

1. Calculate the gradient of the validation loss, \( \mu = \left[ \nabla_\theta \sum_{j=1}^m l(p_j \odot x_j, y_j, \hat{\theta}) \right] \).
2. Initialize \( \hat{H}_u^{-1} \mu = \mu \).
3. **repeat to get HVP**
   4. Uniformly sample some instances from the training set to calculate the estimated Hessian matrix \( \hat{H} \).
   5. Calculate \( \hat{H}_u^{-1} \mu = \mu + (I - \hat{H}) \hat{H}_u^{-1} \mu \).
   6. **until** convergence
   7. Refer to \( h \) as the converged HVP, which is the estimation of \( H_\theta(p)^{-1}[\nabla_\theta \sum_{j=1}^m l(p_j \odot x_j, y_j, \hat{\theta})] \).
8. Calculate \( \nabla_\theta l(p_i \odot x_i, y_i, \hat{\theta}) \).
9. Calculate the gradient of \( h^T \nabla_\theta l(p_i \odot x_i, y_i, \hat{\theta}) \in \mathbb{R} \) over \( x \).

4.2.2 IF calculator. Our main contribution to this work is to introduce the influence function to guide the training of the feature selection model, and further improve the accuracy and robustness of instance-wise feature selection for tabular data. Furthermore, from the definition of IF in Eq. (2), the calculation of IF seems complex. Thus how to efficiently calculate IF is a very important part of this paper.

Let \( p_1 \) and \( p_2 \) be the selecting probability for the features in \( z_1 \) and \( z_2 \) respectively. Then after feature reweighting by \( p_1 \) and \( p_2 \) and obtaining the pre-trained \( \hat{\theta} \), the influence of \( z_i \) over the whole validation set is

\[
\phi_i(p(x, \omega)) = - \left[ \sum_{j=1}^m \nabla_\theta l(p_j \odot x_j, y_j, \hat{\theta}) \right]^T \hat{H}_u^{-1} \phi_i(p(x, \omega)) \equiv - \left[ \sum_{j=1}^m \nabla_\theta l(p_j \odot x_j, y_j, \hat{\theta}) \right]^T \hat{H}_u^{-1} \mu,
\]

where \( \odot \) is the element-wise product, \( \hat{H}_u(p) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla^2_\theta l(p_i \odot x_i, y_i, \hat{\theta}) \). The influence function \( \phi_i(p(x, \omega)) \) can be calculated in three steps: firstly calculate the inverse Hessian-vector-product (HVP) \([\nabla_\theta \sum_{j=1}^m l(p_j \odot x_j, y_j, \hat{\theta})]^T \hat{H}_u(p)^{-1}\) and set the result as a constant vector which is independent of the derivative with \( x \); secondly multiply the constant vector with the \( \nabla_\theta l(p_i \odot x_i, y_i, \hat{\theta}) \) for each training instance, thirdly take the derivative of the vector. The most difficult step is calculating HVP, and we utilize the stochastic estimation method in [11] to efficiently handle the high dimensional and large scale tabular data.

In stochastic estimation, let \( \hat{H}_u^{-1} \mu = \sum_{u=0}^N (I - H)^u \) be the first \( u \) terms in the Taylor expansion of \( H^{-1} \), where \( H \) is an arbitrary Hessian matrix, \( I \) is the unit matrix. Then \( \hat{H}_u^{-1} = I + (I - H) \hat{H}_u^{-1} \), \( \hat{H}_u^{-1} \to H^{-1} \) when \( u \to \infty \). The key is that at each iteration, we can sample some instances to compute an unbiased estimator of \( H \). So we get the following procedure to calculate HVP: uniformly sample some instances from the training set and calculate the Hessian matrix \( \hat{H} \); define \( \hat{H}_u^{-1} \mu = \mu \), where \( \mu = \left[ \nabla_\theta \sum_{j=1}^m l(p_j \odot x_j, y_j, \hat{\theta}) \right] \) in our problem; recursively compute \( \hat{H}_u^{-1} \mu = \mu + (I - \hat{H}) \hat{H}_u^{-1} \mu \).

The details of calculating \( \phi_i(p(x, \omega)) \) are shown in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 2 Discovering Instance-wise Influential Features for Tabular Data (DIWIFT)

**Require:** The training set \( \{ z_i \}_{i=1}^n \), validation set \( \{ z_j \}_{j=1}^m \).

1. Train a pre-trained model with base network to get \( \hat{\theta} \).
2. Initialize all parameters of self-attention network.
3. **repeat**
   4. Feed instances into feature selection model to get probability \( p_i \) and \( p_j \) using Eq. (11).
   5. Calculate influence function in Eq. (12) using the stochastic estimation method.
   6. Calculate the loss in Eq. (13).
   7. Do back-propagation to update the parameters of self-attention network.
8. **until** convergence

5 EXPERIMENTS

In this section, we quantitatively evaluate DIWIFT against various state-of-the-art benchmarks. We experimentally evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed DIWIFT method on seven datasets, three synthetic datasets and four real-world datasets. A series of experiments are conducted to answer the following questions.

- **Q1:** When the model is trained on the instances with instance-wise feature selection via DIWIFT, how does the model performs compared to state-of-the-art (SOTA) methods?
- **Q2:** How to visually check the effectiveness of DIWIFT?
- **Q3:** How do different components of DIWIFT contribute to its performance?
- **Q4:** Can DIWIFT have robust performance when faced with distribution shift?
- **Q5:** Can DIWIFT be robust to the fluctuation of the pre-trained model?

5.1 Datasets

5.1.1 Synthetic Datasets. We continue to use similar methods in previous works to generate synthetic dataset, i.e., L2X [3] and INVERSE [25]. The input features are generated from 11-dimensional Gaussian distribution with no correlations across the features, namely \( x \sim N(0, I) \), and the \( k \)-th feature is denoted as \( x^k \). The label \( y \) is generated from a Bernoulli random variable with \( P(y = 1|x) = \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-x)} \)

- **Syn1:** \( \exp(x_1 x_2) \).
with two global feature selection methods (Lasso \cite{5} and Tree \cite{6}) and four SOTA instance-wise feature selection methods (L2X \cite{3}, CL2X \cite{15}, INVAUSE \cite{25}, TabNet \cite{1}).

- **Syn2**: \(-10 \times \sin 2x^7 + 2 |x^8| + x^9 + \exp(-x^{10})\).

  For the above datasets, the generation of label \(y\) depends on the same subset features for each instance. To compare the ability of different methods to discover instance-wise influential features, we create a dataset in which different instances have different influential features. Here, we set \(x^{11}\) as the “switch” feature:

- **Syn3**: If \(x^{11} < 0\), \(\logit(x)\) follows Syn1; otherwise, \(\logit(x)\) follows Syn2.

5.1.2 Real-world Datasets. Note that the following data sets have also been widely used in previous work focusing on tabular data modeling\cite{10, 13}.

- **Coat**: Coat is a dataset about the preference of users on the coats, which is collected through a simple online web-shop interface \cite{26}. In Coat, 290 users were asked to rate 24 coats from 300 selected by themselves and then rate extra 16 ones randomly selected.

- **Adult**: Adult is a dataset from the Census Bureau and the task is to predict whether a given adult makes more than $50,000 a year \cite{12}. In Adult, every instance has 14 features, and the total number of instances is 137.

- **Bank**: Bank is a dataset related to direct marketing campaigns (phone calls) of a Portuguese banking institution. And the classification goal is to predict if the client will subscribe to a term deposit. In Bank, every instance has 16 features, and the total number of instances is 55.

- **Credit**: Credit is a dataset about credit card fraud provided by a payment service provider in Belgium \cite{4}. In Credit, every instance has 10 features, and the total number of features is 30.

The statistics of these datasets are summarized in Table 3. In the following experiments, we split the instances into three parts: training set, validation set and test set, and the ratio of each split part is 3 : 1 : 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Datasets</th>
<th>#Instance-wise features</th>
<th>#Total features</th>
<th>#Instances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Syn1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syn2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syn3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coat</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>49k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>284k</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Baselines

Following the settings in the previous works \cite{3, 25}, we compare with two global feature selection methods (Lasso \cite{5} and Tree \cite{6}) and four SOTA instance-wise feature selection methods (L2X \cite{3}, CL2X \cite{15}, INVAUSE \cite{25}, TabNet \cite{1}).

- **Lasso** \cite{5}: it is a widely used global feature selection method via adding \(L_1\) regularization to the loss of a linear model.

- **Tree** \cite{6}: it is a global feature selection method via an extremely randomized trees classifier.

- **L2X** \cite{3}: it is an instance-wise feature selection method that could discover fix number of influential features for each instance via mutual information. It is the first method to realize instance-wise feature selection and interpretation.

- **CL2X** \cite{15}: it is a causal extension of L2X, and also discovers fix number of influential features for each instance via conditional mutual information.

- **INVAUSE** \cite{25}: it is an instance-wise feature selection method that could discover an adaptive number of influential features for each instance, via minimizing a Kullback-Leibler divergence between the full conditional distribution and the selected-features-only conditional distribution. It is the most important baseline because it best matches our method.

- **TabNet** \cite{1}: it is an instance-wise feature selection method that could use sequential attention to choose which features to reason from at each decision step. In addition, it proposes a novel high-performance and interpretable canonical deep tabular data learning architecture.

We apply the Area Under the ROC Curve (AUC) as the evaluation metric, which is commonly adopted in tabular data study \cite{1, 24}. Specifically, AUC in binary classification task is calculated by

\[
AUC = \frac{\sum p \cdot s_p \cdot e_x > 1 \cdot (g(z_p) > g(z_q))}{|z^+| \cdot |z^-|}.
\]

where \(z^+\) is the positive instance set, \(z^-\) is the negative instance set, \(|z^+|\) and \(|z^-|\) are their sizes respectively; \(z_p\) is a positive instance, \(z_q\) is a negative instance; \(g(\cdot)\) is a classifier. Note that if the prediction scores of all the positive samples are higher than those of the negative, then the model will achieve AUC=1 (separate positive/negative samples perfectly). The upper bound of AUC is 1, and the larger the better.

5.3 Implementation Details

For all the methods, a three-layer MLP is adopted as the base model, L2-regularization parameter is in the range of \([1e-6, 1]\), learning rate is in \([1e-5, 1e-1]\), hidden layer size is in \([50, 100, 150, 200]\), batch size is in \([64, 128, 256, 512, 1024, 2048]\). LASSO has its special L1 parameter in \([1e-5, 1e-1]\). Tree needs to set tree numbers from 3 to 30. For L2X and CL2X, we set the number of selected features in an instance in range of \([2, \text{field\_dimension}]\). For our DIWIFT, temperature parameter is in \([1e-3, 1]\). Regarding the error analysis, we calculate the standard deviation of AUC metric on the test datasets through 10 random experiments. The standard deviation is calculated as follow:

\[
\text{deviation} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left( s_i - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} s_i \right)^2},
\]

where \(N\) represents the number of random trials and \(s_i\) means the AUC score at the \(i\)-th experiment.

5.4 Comparison Results (Q1)

In order to validate the superiority of DIWIFT, we do the comparison experiments with the SOTA baselines. The detailed results are
shown in Table 4. The method named "No-selection" is the baseline that uses all features without any feature selection. All the base networks here are three-layer multilayer perceptrons.

From Table 4, we have two insights: (i) Our DIWIFT almost consistently outperforms all the baselines in all datasets, (ii) In the four SOTA instance-wise feature selection methods, TabNet is overall best, because L2X and CL2X can only discover a fixed number of influential features for each instance, meanwhile L2X, CL2X and INVALSE are not proposed for tabular data, but TabNet does not have these limitations.

5.5 Visual Verification of DIWIFT (Q2)

Except for the statistical verification in Table 4, we also can visually illustrate the performance of DIWIFT. Because the ground truth of the instance-wise influential features is given in the Syn3 dataset, we randomly sample five instances from Syn3 in which logit(x) follows Syn1, and another five instances in which logit(x) follows Syn2. Feed these ten instances into the feature selection model in DIWIFT, we get the instance-wise feature selection results for these instances.

The results are shown in Figure 3. The first row represents the feature names, including switch feature x^{11}. It is easily noticed that most of the instance-wise influential features are successfully discovered by DIWIFT. Meanwhile, most of the non-influential features are dropped, which validates DIWIFT is effective in discovering an influential subset of features.

5.6 Results of the Ablation Studies (Q3)

As discussed in Section 4.2, the feature selection model and IF calculator is the main components of DIWIFT. In order to understand the respective effects of these two components, we conduct ablation studies on real-world datasets. The results are shown in Figure 4. In Figure 4, "w/o influence" means removing the IF calculator while keeping the feature selection model, and "No-selection" indicates both the feature selection model and IF calculator is removed. For the results in Figure 4, we can see that removing any term will hurt the performance in all the cases. Note that, "w/o influence" is worse than DIWIFT, but still better than "No-selection", which indicates that the self-attention mechanism could also be a feature selector.

5.7 Robustness Analysis for Distribution Shift (Q4)

As discussed in Section 2, all the baselines only consider how to select features to improve model performance in training distribution. On the other hand, DIWIFT is a method based on the influence function, which can minimize the validation loss to make the model more robust and unbiased [19, 26]. As the description of the Coat dataset in Section 5.1, Coat provides two parts of data, the one is biased data collected by the normal interactions of users in the online web-shop platform, and the other one is unbiased data collected from a stochastic experiment where items are assigned randomly.

So there exists a distribution shift between these two parts in Coat. To validate the robustness of DIWIFT under distribution shift, we re-split the Coat dataset: split the biased data in Coat as the training set, randomly split one-half of the unbiased data in Coat as the validation set and another half as the test set. Re-run all the methods in
We can see that DIWIFT is not sensitive to the pre-trained model. This observation is very important for the deployment of DIWIFT in a real scenario, because this reveals that we can use the model trained yesterday as the pre-trained model for the training of today to save the time of pretraining.

6 CONCLUSION

In real-world web applications, different instances usually rely on different features, so instance-wise feature selection is a very important research topic. In this paper, we are the first to introduce an influence function to study instance-wise feature selection problems, and have proposed a novel algorithm named DIWIFT to automate discovering the instance-wise influential features. We also have conducted extensive experiments on both synthetic and real-world datasets and the results validate the effectiveness and robustness of our method.

Table 4, we get the results in Figure 5. Compare with the Coat column in Table 4, we can see that the performances of all the feature selection baselines decrease dramatically, even though all are worth than "No-selection". This reveals that the previous feature selection methods are easy to overfit the training distribution. On the contrary, DIWIFT performs more robustly and has a greater advantage under distribution shift.

5.8 Sensitivity Analysis for Pretrained Model (Q5)

The influence function calculator is an important component of DIWIFT. The calculation of the influence score requires the parameter of the pre-trained model. So we design the experiment to check how sensitive DIWIFT is to the fluctuation of the pre-trained model. In the experiment of DWIFT on Coat in Table 4, the best training epoch of the pre-trained model is the 18-th epoch. Then we extract the models in 16-th epoch, 14-th epoch, 12-th epoch, 10-th epoch, 8-th epoch, to check the performance of DIWIFT when using these models as pre-trained models. The results are shown in Figure 6. We can see that DIWIFT is not sensitive to the pre-trained model. This observation is very important for the deployment of DIWIFT in a real scenario, because this reveals that we can use the model trained yesterday as the pre-trained model for the training of today to save the time of pretraining.

Figure 4: Results of the ablation studies on the real-world datasets

Figure 5: Robustness analysis for distribution shift on re-split Coat.

Figure 6: Sensitivity analysis for DIWIFT method with different pre-trained model on Coat. The blue line represents No-selection method.