

# Interaction Tensor Shap

Hiroki Hasegawa<sup>a</sup>, Yukihiro Okada<sup>b,c,d</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Graduate School of Science and Technology, University of Tsukuba, 1-1-1  
Tennodai, Tsukuba, 305-8573, Ibaraki, Japan*

<sup>b</sup>*Institute of Systems and Information Engineering, University of Tsukuba, 1-1-1  
Tennodai, Tsukuba, 305-8577, Ibaraki, Japan*

<sup>c</sup>*Tsukuba Institute for Advanced Research, University of Tsukuba, 1-1-1  
Tennodai, Tsukuba, 305-8577, Ibaraki, Japan*

<sup>d</sup>*Center for Artificial Intelligence Research, University of Tsukuba, 1-1-1  
Tennodai, Tsukuba, 305-8577, Ibaraki, Japan*

---

## Abstract

Machine-learning models have grown increasingly deep and high-dimensional, making it difficult to understand how individual and combined features influence their predictions. While Shapley-value-based methods provide principled feature attributions, existing formulations cannot tractably evaluate higher-order interactions: the Shapley–Taylor Interaction Index (STII) requires exponential-scale enumeration of subsets, and current tensor-based approaches such as the Marginal SHAP Tensor (MST) are restricted to first-order effects. The central problem is that no existing framework simultaneously preserves the axiomatic exactness of STII and avoids the exponential computational blow-up inherent to high-order discrete derivatives. Here we show that high-order Shapley interactions can be represented exactly as tensor-network contractions, enabling polynomial-time and polylog-depth computation under Tensor-Train (TT) structure. We introduce Interaction Tensor SHAP (IT-SHAP), which reformulates STII as the contraction of a Value Tensor and a Weight Tensor, and assume a finite-state TT representation of the Weight Tensor with polynomial TT ranks. Under TT-structured model and distribution tensors, we show that IT-SHAP reduces the exponential complexity  $\Theta(4^n)$  of STII to  $\text{NC}^2$  parallel time. These results demonstrate that IT-SHAP provides a unified, axiomatic, and computationally tractable formulation of main effects and higher-order interactions in high-dimensional models. This framework establishes a foundation for scalable interaction-aware eXplainable AI, with implications for large black-box models whose combinatorial structure has previously rendered interaction analysis infeasible.

---

## 1. Introduction

Recent advances in machine learning have produced increasingly deep and large models whose internal behavior is difficult to interpret. This opacity has raised concerns regarding their deployment in critical domains, thereby motivating extensive research in eXplainable AI (XAI). A central objective in XAI is to provide quantitative explanations of how predictive models depend on individual input features (Doshi-Velez and Kim, 2017; Guidotti et al., 2018; Ribeiro et al., 2016).

Consequently, methods that attribute model outputs to features in a principled and interpretable manner have become foundational.

SHapley Additive exPlanations (SHAP) quantify the contribution of each feature to a model prediction by leveraging the Shapley value from cooperative game theory (Lundberg and Lee, 2017). SHAP satisfies desirable axioms such as fairness and efficiency, which has led to its widespread adoption. However, the computational cost of exact SHAP is exponential in the feature dimension  $D$ , requiring  $\mathcal{O}(D2^D)$  operations (Lundberg and Lee, 2017). This complexity severely limits its applicability in high-dimensional settings.

A comprehensive survey by Mosca et al. (2022) organizes Shapley-value-based explanation methods along five axes: input structure, model class, core assumptions, explanation type, and estimation efficiency. This paper focuses on the computational aspects highlighted in that survey and develops a structured taxonomy of existing approaches from this perspective.

We categorize Shapley value computation strategies into approximation-based acceleration methods and structure-exploiting exact methods. Approximation-based methods aim to reduce the exponential complexity of exact Shapley computation while preserving its axiomatic properties. KernelSHAP (Lundberg and Lee, 2017) and conditional-distribution-based approaches (Aas et al., 2021; Bachmann, 2025; Olsen et al., 2022) fall into this class. These methods make no assumptions about model structure and therefore exhibit broad applicability, yet they inevitably introduce approximation error.

In contrast, structure-exploiting exact methods assume specific model representations to achieve polynomial-time or shallow-parallel-depth computation of Shapley values. Representative examples include exact SHAP computation for decision trees (Lundberg et al., 2020), tractability results for Boolean circuits (Arenas et al., 2023), and the Marginal SHAP Tensor (MST) based on Tensor-Train (TT) representations (Marzouk et al., 2025). Although these methods sacrifice generality, the resulting Shapley values are exact.

Research has also advanced beyond single-feature attributions to capture interactions among features. Early work on Shapley interaction indices (Owen, 1972; Grabisch and Roubens, 1999) has evolved into the Shapley–Taylor Interaction Index (STII) (Sundararajan et al., 2020). More recent sampling-based estimators, such as SHAP-IQ and SVARM-IQ (Fumagalli et al., 2023; Kolpaczki et al., 2024), aim to approximate interaction effects of arbitrary order. Consequently, interaction-based attribution has become a major research theme in SHAP-related studies.

Despite these developments, fundamental computational challenges remain. Precise evaluation of STII requires enumerating all subsets of the feature set, leading to exponential complexity. Sampling-based estimators can approximate high-order interactions but do not reproduce the discrete-derivative semantics that define STII. Furthermore, TT-based approaches (Marzouk et al., 2025) enable efficient computation of Marginal SHAP but do not extend to a unified representation of all interaction orders. Therefore, no existing framework simultaneously preserves the theoretical exactness of STII and avoids exponential blow-up in high-order interaction computation.

This paper proposes a general computational framework that addresses this limitation. Building

on TT-based Shapley computation (Marzouk et al., 2025), we exploit the ability of TT structures to efficiently encode high-dimensional tensors. To this end, we introduce *Interaction Tensor SHAP* (IT-SHAP), a unified tensor-based representation of the Shapley–Taylor Interaction Index. Our formulation expresses all interaction orders within a single TT-based tensor network and demonstrates that the associated computation reduces from exponential to polynomial order under suitable rank conditions. Our analysis reveals that IT-SHAP provides a tractable and theoretically grounded extension of classical SHAP theory for high-order interaction attribution.

## 2. Preliminaries

This section presents the theoretical components that support the formulation and analysis of the proposed method. Specifically, it summarizes the foundations on which the framework is built, namely the STII and the MST. Section 2.1 introduces the notation used throughout the paper. Section 2.2 reviews the definition of STII, and Section 2.3 summarizes the MST framework.

### 2.1. Notation

This subsection introduces the notation used throughout the paper in order to specify the mathematical objects under consideration. Sets are denoted by capital roman letters, and for any integer  $N \geq 1$  we define  $[N] = \{1, \dots, N\}$  as the finite index set with  $N$  elements. For a set  $A$ , its power set is written  $2^A$ , and a subset of  $A$  is denoted  $S \subseteq A$ . The indicator vector of a subset  $S \subseteq [N]$  is  $\sigma \in \{0, 1\}^N$ , where  $\sigma_i = 1$  if and only if  $i \in S$ . The complement of  $S$  is written  $S^c$ .

Scalars are written in lowercase roman letters. The real numbers and natural numbers are denoted by  $\mathbb{R}$  and  $\mathbb{N}$ , respectively. Vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  are written in bold lowercase (e.g.,  $\mathbf{x}$ ), and the  $i$ -th component of  $\mathbf{x}$  is denoted  $x_i$ . For integers  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , the standard basis vector  $\mathbf{e}_i^n \in \mathbb{R}^n$  has its  $i$ -th entry equal to 1 and all other entries equal to 0. The vector  $\mathbf{1}_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$  denotes the all-ones vector. Matrices are denoted by bold uppercase (e.g.,  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ ), with entries written  $A_{ij}$ .

Tensors are denoted by calligraphic uppercase letters (e.g.,  $\mathcal{X}$ ). An  $N$ -th order tensor  $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{I_1 \times \dots \times I_N}$  has entries  $X_{i_1 \dots i_N}$  indexed by multi-indices. We identify  $\mathbb{R}^{I_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbb{R}^{I_N}$  with the corresponding tensor product space, and interpret  $\mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{v}$  as the outer product. Throughout the paper, we use the multi-index space

$$m^{\otimes n} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} [m] \times \dots \times [m] \quad (n \text{ times}),$$

which represents the  $n$ -fold Cartesian product where each mode has  $m$  possible indices.

Tensor contractions are written as  $\mathcal{A} \times_S \mathcal{B}$  and correspond to the inner-product operation over the common modes  $S$ , following the notation in Marzouk et al. (2025). The mode- $n$  tensor–matrix product is written  $\mathcal{X} \times_n \mathbf{A}$  and is defined as

$$(\mathcal{X} \times_n \mathbf{A})_{i_1 \dots j \dots i_N} = \sum_{i_n} \mathcal{X}_{i_1 \dots i_n \dots i_N} A_{ji_n},$$

as standard in Kolda and Bader (2009).

Permutations are bijections  $\pi : [N] \rightarrow [N]$ , and the set of all permutations is denoted  $S_N$ . A permutation  $\pi$  imposes an order on the feature set, written  $\pi(1), \pi(2), \dots, \pi(N)$ . For a subset  $S \subseteq [N]$ , the set of features in  $S$  that appear before a given position under  $\pi$  is denoted by  $\pi_S$ .

Since the paper analyzes permutation expectations, we introduce a probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  and denote the expectation of a random variable  $X : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by  $\mathbb{E}[X]$ . The permutation expectation  $\mathbb{E}_\pi[\cdot]$  is defined with respect to the uniform distribution over  $S_N$ .

To examine the computational difficulty of tensor-network (TN) contraction problems, we recall several complexity classes. The class P contains all decision problems solvable in polynomial time in the input size and serves as a standard foundation for efficient computation Arora and Barak (2009). The class #P consists of counting problems associated with combinatorial solution sets; a problem is #P-hard if every problem in #P can be reduced to it in polynomial time Arora and Barak (2009).

Nick’s Class (NC) characterizes problems solvable on parallel computation models using a polynomial number of processors and polylogarithmic runtime Cook (2023). Processors refer to computational units in theoretical models such as the Parallel Random Access Machine (PRAM). The subclass  $\text{NC}^k$  consists of problems solvable using depth at most  $(\log n)^k$ , and the parameter  $k$  measures the degree of achievable parallelism.

The notation introduced above provides a uniform representation for value functions, discrete derivatives, the STII, and tensor-network–based contraction formulas used in the remainder of the paper.

## 2.2. STII

The purpose of this subsection is to establish the theoretical framework required to treat value functions, discrete derivatives, and interaction indices in a unified manner. The STII provides such a framework. STII extends the Shapley value by preserving its first-order attributions while defining higher-order interactions in a coherent and consistent fashion. Its construction relies on discrete derivatives of value functions, which align with multivariate Taylor expansion in the discrete domain. Moreover, STII satisfies a uniqueness characterization derived from the Shapley axioms together with an additional interaction-distribution principle. These properties yield a theoretically robust formulation that offers a more unified foundation than the classical Shapley interaction index (Grabisch and Roubens, 1999).

### 2.2.1. Value Functions and Discrete Derivatives

Let  $n_{\text{in}}$  denote the number of features, and let  $[n_{\text{in}}]$  be the corresponding feature index set. A function

$$F : 2^{n_{\text{in}}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

is called a value function, where  $F(S)$  assigns a real number to any subset  $S \subseteq [n_{\text{in}}]$ . We consider a machine-learning model  $M : \mathbb{R}^{n_{\text{in}}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with input vector  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_{n_{\text{in}}})$ . For any subset

$S \subseteq [n_{\text{in}}]$ , we write

$$\mathbf{x}_S = (x_i)_{i \in S}, \quad \mathbf{x}_{S^c} = (x_i)_{i \in S^c},$$

where  $S^c$  is the complement of  $S$  in  $[n_{\text{in}}]$ .

Practical SHAP-based attribution methods typically define the value function using conditional imputation. Given a subset  $S$ , the components  $\mathbf{x}_{S^c}$  are imputed according to the conditional distribution  $p(\mathbf{x}_{S^c} \mid \mathbf{x}_S)$ , and the value function is defined by

$$F(S) = \mathbb{E}[M(\mathbf{x}) \mid \mathbf{x}_S, \mathbf{x}_{S^c} \sim p(\mathbf{x}_{S^c} \mid \mathbf{x}_S)].$$

Although this form is standard in applications, the theory of STII does not require  $F$  to be defined via conditional expectations. The framework treats  $F$  as an arbitrary set function  $F : 2^{n_{\text{in}}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .

To extend Shapley-style reasoning to interactions, we introduce the discrete derivative  $\delta_S F(T)$  for subsets  $S \subseteq [n_{\text{in}}]$  and  $T \subseteq [n_{\text{in}}] \setminus S$ , defined by

$$\delta_S F(T) = \sum_{W \subseteq S} (-1)^{|S|-|W|} F(T \cup W).$$

This operator computes the incremental effect of introducing all features in  $S$  simultaneously, using an inclusion–exclusion expansion. When  $|S| = 1$ , the discrete derivative reduces to a main effect; when  $|S| \geq 2$ , it captures higher-order interactions among the features in  $S$ .

### 2.2.2. Definition of STII

We now define the STII. A permutation on  $[n_{\text{in}}]$  is a bijection  $\pi : [n_{\text{in}}] \rightarrow [n_{\text{in}}]$ , and the set of all permutations is the symmetric group  $S_{n_{\text{in}}}$ . For  $\pi \in S_{n_{\text{in}}}$  and  $i \in [n_{\text{in}}]$ , we define

$$\pi_i := \{j \in [n_{\text{in}}] : \pi^{-1}(j) < \pi^{-1}(i)\},$$

namely, the set of features that precede  $i$  in the ordering  $\pi(1), \dots, \pi(n_{\text{in}})$ .

For a subset  $S \subseteq [n_{\text{in}}]$ , we write

$$\pi_S := \bigcap_{i \in S} \pi_i,$$

the set of features that appear before every element of  $S$  under  $\pi$ .

Given a value function  $F$  and its discrete derivative  $\delta_S F(T)$ , the local contribution of a permutation to the order- $k$  interaction of  $S$  is

$$I_{S,\pi}^k(F) = \begin{cases} \delta_S F(\emptyset), & |S| < k, \\ \delta_S F(\pi_S), & |S| = k. \end{cases}$$

If  $|S| < k$ , the contribution coincides with the discrete derivative at the empty context, matching lower-order Taylor coefficients. If  $|S| = k$ , the interaction is evaluated at the permutation-dependent context  $\pi_S$ .

The STII of order  $k$  is the permutation expectation:

$$I_S^k(F) = \mathbb{E}_{\pi \in S_{n_{\text{in}}}} \left[ I_{S,\pi}^k(F) \right],$$

where the expectation is taken under the uniform distribution over  $S_{n_{\text{in}}}$ .

For  $k = 1$  and  $S = \{i\}$ ,

$$I_{\{i\}}^1(F) = \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [F(\pi_i \cup \{i\}) - F(\pi_i)],$$

which coincides with the standard Shapley value. Thus STII generalizes the Shapley value to higher-order interactions.

### 2.2.3. Closed-form Expression and Computational Complexity

Using properties of discrete derivatives, STII admits the closed-form expression

$$I_S^k(F) = \frac{k}{n_{\text{in}}} \sum_{T \subseteq [n_{\text{in}}] \setminus S} \frac{\delta_S F(T)}{\binom{n_{\text{in}}-1}{|T|}}.$$

This expression aggregates the discrete derivatives  $\delta_S F(T)$  for all  $T \subseteq [n_{\text{in}}] \setminus S$  using a specific weighting consistent with the permutation-based definition.

The computational cost of evaluating  $I_S^k(F)$  is exponential. Each discrete derivative requires summing over all subsets  $W \subseteq S$ , of which there are  $2^{|S|}$  possibilities. The number of possible contexts  $T \subseteq [n_{\text{in}}] \setminus S$  is  $2^{n_{\text{in}}-|S|}$ . Therefore, for fixed  $S$ ,

$$2^{|S|} \times 2^{n_{\text{in}}-|S|} = 2^{n_{\text{in}}}$$

operations are required.

For order  $k$ , the number of subsets with size at most  $k$  is  $\Theta(n_{\text{in}}^k)$ , leading to total complexity

$$\mathcal{O}(2^{n_{\text{in}}} n_{\text{in}}^k).$$

In the worst case, when  $k = n_{\text{in}}$ , the number of subsets reaches  $2^{n_{\text{in}}}$ , resulting in overall complexity

$$\mathcal{O}(4^{n_{\text{in}}}).$$

Thus, STII necessarily exhibits exponential complexity regardless of the order  $k$ .

### 2.2.4. Axiomatic Characterization

STII is uniquely characterized by five axioms: the Linearity, Dummy, Symmetry, and Efficiency axioms from the Shapley value, and the Interaction Distribution Axiom specific to STII (Sundararajan et al., 2020).

The Linearity Axiom requires that for any value functions  $F_1, F_2$  and constant  $c$ ,

$$I_S^k(F_1 + F_2) = I_S^k(F_1) + I_S^k(F_2), \quad I_S^k(cF_1) = c I_S^k(F_1).$$

The Dummy Axiom states that if a feature  $i$  satisfies

$$F(S) = F(S \setminus \{i\}) + F(\{i\}) \quad (\forall i \in S),$$

then

$$I_{\{i\}}^k(F) = F(\{i\}), \quad I_S^k(F) = 0 \quad (i \in S, |S| \geq 2).$$

The Symmetry Axiom requires that for any permutation  $\pi$ ,

$$I_S^k(F) = I_{\pi(S)}^k(\pi F).$$

The Efficiency Axiom states that the total contribution of all interactions up to order  $k$  satisfies

$$\sum_{\substack{S \subseteq N \\ |S| \leq k}} I_S^k(F) = F(N) - F(\emptyset).$$

The Interaction Distribution Axiom concerns pure interactions defined by

$$F_T(S) = \begin{cases} c, & T \subseteq S, \\ 0, & T \not\subseteq S, \end{cases}$$

and requires

$$I_S^k(F_T) = 0 \quad (S \subset T, |S| < k).$$

This ensures that higher-order interactions do not influence lower-order components.

These five axioms uniquely identify STII. When  $k = 1$ , the Interaction Distribution Axiom becomes vacuous, because the only subset with  $|S| < 1$  is the empty set, and  $I_\emptyset^1(F) = 0$  already follows from the Shapley value definition. Hence,

$$I_{\{i\}}^1(F) = \phi_i(F),$$

and STII reduces exactly to the classical Shapley value. The additional axiom becomes meaningful only when  $k \geq 2$ , where it enforces a hierarchical allocation of interactions.

#### 2.2.5. Consistency with the Multilinear Extension

A standard continuous embedding of the value function  $F$  into  $[0, 1]^{n_{\text{in}}}$  is given by the multilinear extension

$$f(x) = \sum_{S \subseteq [n_{\text{in}}]} F(S) \prod_{i \in S} x_i \prod_{i \notin S} (1 - x_i).$$

Since  $f$  is a polynomial, it admits a Taylor expansion. Its mixed partial derivatives  $\Delta_S f(x)$  coincide with the discrete derivatives  $\delta_S F(T)$ , and this correspondence underpins the analytical formulation of STII.

Using this extension, Sundararajan et al. (2020) showed that for  $|S| < k$ ,

$$I_S^k(F) = \Delta_S f(0),$$

the exact Taylor coefficient at the origin. For  $S = \{i_1, \dots, i_m\}$ , the mixed partial derivative is

$$\Delta_S f(x) = \frac{\partial^m f(x)}{\partial x_{i_1} \cdots \partial x_{i_m}}.$$

For  $|S| = k$ , the STII term is given by the integral representation

$$I_S^k(F) = \int_0^1 k(1-t)^{k-1} \Delta_S f(t) dt.$$

This expression parallels the integral form of higher-order Taylor coefficients.

These relationships demonstrate that STII establishes a precise correspondence between the discrete Shapley-style formulation and the continuous Taylor-based decomposition induced by the multilinear extension. STII therefore provides the unique interaction index that consistently decomposes model contributions across orders without overlap in both the discrete and continuous frameworks.

### 2.3. MST

This subsection describes the tensor-based formulation that underlies the computational framework used in this study. The central idea is to represent SHAP computations as tensor-network (TN) contractions and to impose a TT structure on the corresponding tensors in order to enable efficient evaluation. We summarize the mathematical structure and computation procedure using the value-function notation introduced in the previous section.

#### 2.3.1. SHAP Definition and Tensorization of the Value Function

Let  $n_{\text{in}}$  denote the number of features, and let  $[n_{\text{in}}] = \{1, \dots, n_{\text{in}}\}$  be the feature index set. The discrete input domain is

$$\mathbb{D} = [N_1] \times \cdots \times [N_{n_{\text{in}}}],$$

where  $[N_j]$  denotes the set of possible discrete values of feature  $j$ . The model is

$$M : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_{\text{out}}},$$

and an input instance is written  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_{n_{\text{in}}}) \in \mathbb{D}$ . For any subset  $S \subseteq [n_{\text{in}}]$ , we write

$$\mathbf{x}_S = (x_i)_{i \in S}, \quad \mathbf{x}_{S^c} = (x_i)_{i \in S^c},$$

where  $S^c$  is the complement of  $S$ .



Given input  $\mathbf{x}$  and a background distribution  $P$ , the associated value function is

$$V_M(M, \mathbf{x}; P) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}' \sim P} [M(\mathbf{x}_S, \mathbf{x}'_{S^c})]. \quad (1)$$

This quantity represents the expected model output obtained by keeping the features in  $S$  fixed at  $\mathbf{x}$  and imputing the remaining features  $\mathbf{x}_{S^c}$  from the distribution  $P$ . Thus  $V_M(M, \mathbf{x}; P)$  coincides with the value function  $F_{n_{\text{out}}} : 2^{n_{\text{in}}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_{\text{out}}}$  induced by the SHAP framework.

The SHAP value of feature  $i \in [n_{\text{in}}]$  for input  $\mathbf{x}$  is defined as the Shapley value of the function  $V_M$ :

$$\phi_i(M, \mathbf{x}, P) = \sum_{S \subseteq [n_{\text{in}}] \setminus \{i\}} W(S) (V_M(\mathbf{x}, S \cup \{i\}; P) - V_M(\mathbf{x}, S; P)) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{\text{out}}}, \quad (2)$$

where the combinatorial weight is

$$W(S) = \frac{|S|! (n_{\text{in}} - |S| - 1)!}{n_{\text{in}}!}.$$

Using (2), we define the MST  $\mathcal{T}^{(M,P)} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{D} \times n_{\text{in}} \times n_{\text{out}}}$  by

$$\forall (\mathbf{x}, i) \in \mathbb{D} \times [n_{\text{in}}] : \quad \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{x}, i, \cdot}^{(M,P)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \phi_i(\mathcal{T}^M, \mathbf{x}, \mathcal{T}^P). \quad (3)$$

Here  $\mathcal{T}^M$  and  $\mathcal{T}^P$  denote TT representations of the model  $M$  and the distribution  $P$ , respectively.

A TT decomposition expresses a tensor  $\mathcal{T}$  as a linear chain of third-order TT cores

$$\mathcal{T}^{(1)}, \mathcal{T}^{(2)}, \dots, \mathcal{T}^{(n)}, \quad \mathcal{T}^{(j)} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{j-1} \times N_j \times d_j},$$

yielding

$$\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}^{(1)} \times_{(3,1)} \mathcal{T}^{(2)} \times_{(3,1)} \cdots \times_{(3,1)} \mathcal{T}^{(n)} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_0 \times N_1 \times \cdots \times N_n \times d_n}. \quad (4)$$

Conventionally,  $d_0 = 1$  (or  $d_n = 1$ ), so the corresponding TT core is a matrix. For tensors  $T^{(1)}$  and  $T^{(2)}$ , the contraction

$$T^{(1)} \times_{(i,j)} T^{(2)}$$

creates a new tensor by summing over mode  $i$  of  $T^{(1)}$  and mode  $j$  of  $T^{(2)}$ :

$$[T^{(1)} \times_{(i,j)} T^{(2)}]_{a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_n, b_1, \dots, b_{j-1}, b_{j+1}, \dots, b_m} = \sum_{k=1}^{d_i} T_{a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}, k, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_n}^{(1)} T_{b_1, \dots, b_{j-1}, k, b_{j+1}, \dots, b_m}^{(2)}.$$

### 2.3.2. Tensor-Network Representation of Marginal SHAP

Given  $\mathcal{T}^M$  and  $\mathcal{T}^P$ , the MST is obtained via the contraction

$$\mathcal{T}^{(M,P)} = \widetilde{\mathcal{W}} \times_S \mathcal{V}^{(M,P)} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{D} \times n_{\text{in}} \times n_{\text{out}}}, \quad (5)$$

where the contraction index set is

$$S := \{(k + 1, k + n_{\text{in}} + 1) : k \in [n_{\text{in}}]\}.$$

The Modified Weighted Coalitional Tensor (MWCT)  $\widetilde{\mathcal{W}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{\text{in}} \times 2^{\otimes n_{\text{in}}}}$  is defined by

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_{i,s_1,\dots,s_{n_{\text{in}}}} = \begin{cases} -W(s - \mathbf{1}_{n_{\text{in}}}), & s_i = 1, \\ W(s - \mathbf{1}_{n_{\text{in}}}), & s_i = 2, \end{cases}$$

where  $W(\cdot)$  is the Shapley combinatorial weight, and the operation  $s - \mathbf{1}_{n_{\text{in}}}$  converts  $s_j \in \{1, 2\}$  to binary  $\{0, 1\}$ . The sign convention encodes the difference between the contributions of  $S$  and  $S \cup \{i\}$  within the tensor-network representation.

The Marginal Value Tensor  $\mathcal{V}^{(M,P)} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{D} \times [2]^{\otimes n_{\text{in}} \times n_{\text{out}}}}$  is defined using router tensors  $\mathcal{M}^{(i)}$  as

$$\mathcal{V}^{(M,P)} = (\mathcal{M}^{(1)} \circ \mathcal{M}^{(2)} \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{M}^{(n_{\text{in}})}) \times_{S_1} \mathcal{T}^M \times_{S_2} \mathcal{T}^P,$$

where

$$S_k := \{((5 - k) \cdot i, i) : i \in [n_{\text{in}}]\}.$$

Each router tensor  $\mathcal{M}^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^{N_i \times 2 \times N_i^{\otimes 2}}$  selects, for feature  $i$ , either the fixed value from the input instance  $\mathbf{x}$  or an imputed value drawn from the distribution  $P$ , depending on the binary index in mode 2. This routing operation implements the SHAP intervention  $(\mathbf{x}_S, \mathbf{x}'_{S^c})$  within the TN structure. The operator  $\circ$  denotes the TT-style concatenation of the sequence of router tensors.

Together,  $\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}$  and  $\mathcal{V}^{(M,P)}$  provide a complete TN formulation of the MST, enabling efficient computation when  $\mathcal{T}^M$  and  $\mathcal{T}^P$  satisfy low-rank TT structure.

### 2.3.3. General Tensor-Network Assumptions Lead to #P-hardness

This study assumes that both the model tensor  $\mathcal{T}^M$  and the background-distribution tensor  $\mathcal{T}^P$  admit TT structure when computing the MST. A TT representation is a special case of a tensor network (TN) with a one-dimensional chain topology, for which contraction can be performed in polynomial time. Under this assumption, the contraction in (5) is computationally tractable.

In contrast, the situation changes substantially when one considers general TN structures. Marzouk et al. (2025) establishes that, for SHAP-based value functions, contracting TN representations is #P-hard under general TN architectures. This hardness result implies that the TT assumption is essential for ensuring tractability of the MST. Hence, there is a clear computational dichotomy: general TN structures lead to #P-hard contraction, whereas TT structures enable polynomial-time computation. The present work adopts the TT assumption precisely to avoid this hardness barrier and to guarantee that the MST can be computed within feasible time.

### 2.3.4. Computational Gains Under the TT Assumption

We first summarize the computational cost associated with converting the MWCT  $\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}$  into TT form. As shown in Marzouk et al. (2025),  $\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}$  admits a TT representation

$$\langle G^{(1)}, G^{(2)}, \dots, G^{(n_{\text{in}})} \rangle.$$

The TT cores have dimensions

$$G^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{\text{in}} \times 2 \times n_{\text{in}}^2}, \quad G^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{\text{in}}^2 \times 2 \times n_{\text{in}}^2} \ (2 \leq i \leq n_{\text{in}} - 1), \quad G^{(n_{\text{in}})} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{\text{in}}^2 \times 2}.$$

Moreover, the TT representation can be constructed using  $O(\log n_{\text{in}})$  computational depth and  $O(n_{\text{in}}^3)$  parallel processors.

Next, assume that both the model tensor  $\mathcal{T}^M$  and the background-distribution tensor  $\mathcal{T}^P$  have TT decompositions,

$$\mathcal{T}^M = \langle \mathcal{I}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathcal{I}^{(n_{\text{in}})} \rangle, \quad \mathcal{T}^P = \langle \mathcal{P}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathcal{P}^{(n_{\text{in}})} \rangle.$$

Under this assumption, the MST  $\mathcal{T}^{(M,P)}$  admits the TT structure

$$\left\langle \mathcal{M}^{(1)} \times_{(4,2)} \mathcal{I}^{(1)} \times_{(3,2)} \mathcal{P}^{(1)} \times_{(2,2)} \mathcal{G}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathcal{M}^{(n_{\text{in}})} \times_{(4,2)} \mathcal{I}^{(n_{\text{in}})} \times_{(3,2)} \mathcal{P}^{(n_{\text{in}})} \times_{(2,2)} \mathcal{G}^{(n_{\text{in}})} \right\rangle.$$

The tensors  $\{\mathcal{G}^{(i)}\}_{i \in [n_{\text{in}}]}$  and  $\{\mathcal{M}^{(i)}\}_{i \in [n_{\text{in}}]}$  are those defined in the previous subsection. With this structure, the MST can be computed in NC, and in particular it belongs to NC<sup>2</sup>; see Marzouk et al. (2025), p. 37.

These results demonstrate that the TT assumption enables highly parallelizable computation of Marginal SHAP, in stark contrast to the intractability of general TN contractions.

## 3. Problem Formulation

### 3.1. Objective

The objective of this study is to develop a unified framework that represents both first-order Shapley attributions and higher-order interactions, as characterized by the STII, within a single tensor-structured formulation. Existing MST methods are limited to first-order contributions and do not provide a theoretical mechanism for representing interactions of order two or higher. Conversely, STII offers a mathematically rigorous formulation for interactions of arbitrary order, but its reliance on discrete derivatives and expectations over the full permutation group leads to exponential computational cost, making direct application infeasible in high-dimensional settings.

This study integrates the strengths of these two approaches: the computational efficiency enabled by TT structure and the precise interaction semantics provided by STII. To this end, we propose *Interaction Tensor SHAP (IT-SHAP)*, a new Shapley-based attribution method that expresses both main effects and higher-order interactions as tensor-network computations. IT-SHAP provides a

general theoretical framework that estimates contributions of all interaction orders within a single tensor architecture, thereby extending Shapley-based explanations to high-dimensional feature spaces in a computationally tractable manner.

### 3.2. Theoretical Foundations of IT-SHAP

This subsection establishes the foundational framework required to express STII as a tensor. STII is defined for a value function  $F : 2^{n_{\text{in}}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_{\text{out}}}$  using discrete derivatives  $\delta_S F(T)$ , aggregated over subsets  $T \subseteq [n_{\text{in}}] \setminus S$  with appropriate weighting. Consequently, STII must operate on a tensorized representation of the value function. To accomplish this, the value function  $F$  is embedded into a tensor indexed by  $\{0, 1\}^{n_{\text{in}}}$ , which serves as the domain of all binary indicator vectors of subsets. In what follows, we refer to the tensorized Shapley value representation as the MST.

#### 3.2.1. Consistency Between STII and MST

This subsection establishes the correspondence between the STII and the MST. We first verify that the value function used in STII for the case  $k = 1$  coincides with the value function employed in MST. For an input  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$  and a subset  $S \subseteq N = \{1, \dots, n_{\text{in}}\}$ , the value function is defined as

$$F_{\mathbf{x}}(S) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}' \sim P} [M(\mathbf{x}_S, \mathbf{x}'_{S^c})], \quad (6)$$

where  $\mathbf{x}_S$  denotes the projection of  $\mathbf{x}$  onto the coordinates indexed by  $S$ , and features in  $S^c$  are replaced with samples drawn from the background distribution  $P$ . STII derives higher-order interactions by applying discrete derivatives to this value function. Its closed-form expression is given by

$$I_S^{(k)}(F) = \frac{k}{n_{\text{in}}} \sum_{T \subseteq [n_{\text{in}}] \setminus S} \frac{\delta_S F(T)}{\binom{n_{\text{in}}-1}{|T|}}, \quad (7)$$

where the discrete derivative is

$$\delta_S F(T) = \sum_{W \subseteq S} (-1)^{|S|-|W|} F(T \cup W). \quad (8)$$

To express this structure in the tensorized representation used by MST, we introduce routing indices

$$s = (s_1, \dots, s_{n_{\text{in}}}) \in \{1, 2\}^{n_{\text{in}}},$$

where

$$s_i = 1 \Rightarrow x_i, \quad s_i = 2 \Rightarrow x'_i.$$

The subset encoded by  $s$  is defined as

$$S(s) = \{i \in N : s_i = 1\}.$$

The Value Tensor is then given by

$$\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{x},s,y}^{(M,P)} = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}' \sim P} \left[ T_{\text{do}(x'_1, s_1, x_1), \dots, \text{do}(x'_{n_{\text{in}}}, s_{n_{\text{in}}}, x_{n_{\text{in}}}), y}^M \right]. \quad (9)$$

This construction yields the identity

$$\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{x},s,y}^{(M,P)} = F_{\mathbf{x},y}(S(s)), \quad (10)$$

and consequently, for any  $T, W \subseteq [n_{\text{in}}]$ ,

$$F_{\mathbf{x},y}(T \cup W) = \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{x},s(T \cup W),y}^{(M,P)}. \quad (11)$$

Substituting (11) into the discrete derivative expression (8), we obtain

$$\delta_S F(T) = \sum_{W \subseteq S} (-1)^{|S|-|W|} \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{x},s(T \cup W),y}^{(M,P)}. \quad (12)$$

Substituting this into the closed-form expression of STII (7), we derive a linear representation of the form

$$I_S^{(k)}(F) = \sum_{\tau \in \{1,2\}^{n_{\text{in}}}} \alpha_S^{(k)}(\tau) \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{x},\tau,y}^{(M,P)}, \quad (13)$$

with weights

$$\alpha_S^{(k)}(\tau) = \frac{k}{n_{\text{in}}} \sum_{\substack{T \subseteq [n_{\text{in}}] \setminus S \\ W \subseteq S \\ T \cup W = U(\tau)}} \frac{(-1)^{|S|-|W|}}{\binom{n_{\text{in}}-1}{|T|}}, \quad U(\tau) = \{i : \tau_i = 1\}. \quad (14)$$

Introducing the weight tensor

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}^{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^{|S_k| \times 2^{n_{\text{in}}}}, \quad \widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_{S,\tau}^{(k)} = \alpha_S^{(k)}(\tau),$$

we obtain the tensor contraction form

$$\mathcal{T}^{(k)}(M, P) = \widetilde{\mathcal{W}}^{(k)} \times_2 \mathcal{V}^{(M,P)}. \quad (15)$$

In particular,

$$\mathcal{T}^{(k)}(M, P)_{S,\mathbf{x},y} = \sum_{\tau \in \{1,2\}^{n_{\text{in}}}} \widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_{S,\tau}^{(k)} \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{x},\tau,y}^{(M,P)}.$$

**Theorem 1** (IT-SHAP). *Let  $\mathcal{S}_k = \{S \subseteq [n_{\text{in}}] : |S| \leq k\}$ . Then the order- $k$  IT-SHAP value tensor is given by*

$$\mathcal{T}^{(k)}(M, P) = \widetilde{\mathcal{W}}^{(k)} \times_2 \mathcal{V}^{(M,P)} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{D} \times |S_k| \times n_{\text{out}}}.$$

### 3.2.2. Lemmas for IT-SHAP

The representation in Theorem 1 coincides with the definition of STII and therefore inherits all axioms satisfied by STII, including Linearity, Dummy, Symmetry, Efficiency, and the Interaction Distribution axiom. We now establish consistency with MST for the case  $k = 1$ .

**Lemma 2** (Consistency for the First-Order Case). *For  $k = 1$ , the IT-SHAP value tensor coincides with the MST.*

To illustrate this correspondence, we examine the cases  $k = 1$  and  $k = 2$ . For  $k = 1$ , the weight tensor satisfies

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_{\{i\},\tau}^{(1)} = \frac{1}{n_{\text{in}}} [F(U(\tau) \cup \{i\}) - F(U(\tau))],$$

where  $U(\tau) = \{j : \tau_j = 1\}$ . This term corresponds to the increment

$$F(S \cup \{i\}) - F(S)$$

averaged over all subsets  $S \subseteq [n_{\text{in}}]$ , thereby matching the MST representation component-wise.

For  $k = 2$ , the weight tensor for a feature pair  $S = \{i, j\}$  is

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_{\{i,j\},\tau}^{(2)} = \frac{2}{n_{\text{in}}} \sum_{T \subseteq [n_{\text{in}}] \setminus \{i,j\}} \frac{F(U(\tau)) - F(U(\tau) \cup \{i\}) - F(U(\tau) \cup \{j\}) + F(U(\tau) \cup \{i, j\})}{\binom{n_{\text{in}}-1}{|T|}}.$$

The four-term linear combination corresponds exactly to the second-order discrete derivative

$$\delta_{\{i,j\}} F(T) = F(T \cup \{i, j\}) - F(T \cup \{i\}) - F(T \cup \{j\}) + F(T),$$

showing that the order-2 IT-SHAP value tensor implements the second-order interaction encoded by STII through contraction with the Value Tensor. Thus, IT-SHAP provides a direct generalization of MST ( $k = 1$ ) to higher-order interactions.

### 3.2.3. Illustrative Example of MWCT for $n_{\text{in}} = 3$ and $k = 2$

This subsection introduces an illustrative example that clarifies how the MWCT  $\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}^{(k)}$  encodes the discrete derivative structure of the STII within a TN. The example considers the smallest nontrivial setting with feature dimension  $n_{\text{in}} = 3$  and interaction order  $k = 2$ .

To establish the basic setting, note that for  $n_{\text{in}} = 3$  the routing index is given by  $\tau = (\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3) \in \{1, 2\}^3$ , producing 8 possible configurations. Each  $\tau$  uniquely determines a subset

$$U(\tau) = \{i \in \{1, 2, 3\} : \tau_i = 1\}.$$

For example,  $\tau = (1, 2, 1)$  yields  $U(\tau) = \{1, 3\}$ .

The MWCT component of order  $k = 2$  associated with a feature pair  $S = \{i, j\}$  is defined as

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_{S,\tau}^{(2)} = \sum_{W \subseteq S} (-1)^{|S|-|W|} \omega^{(2)}(W, \tau),$$

where  $\omega^{(2)}(W, \tau)$  denotes the local weight corresponding to the second-order discrete derivative in STII and depends solely on  $U(\tau)$ .

Consider the concrete case  $S = \{1, 2\}$  and  $\tau = (1, 2, 1)$ . Since  $U(\tau) = \{1, 3\}$ , enumerating all subsets  $W \subseteq \{1, 2\}$ , namely  $W \in \{\emptyset, \{1\}, \{2\}, \{1, 2\}\}$ , yields

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_{\{1,2\},(1,2,1)}^{(2)} = \omega^{(2)}(\{1, 2\}, \tau) - \omega^{(2)}(\{1\}, \tau) - \omega^{(2)}(\{2\}, \tau) + \omega^{(2)}(\emptyset, \tau).$$

This linear combination corresponds exactly to the second-order discrete derivative

$$\delta_{\{1,2\}} F(U(\tau)) = F(U(\tau) \cup \{1, 2\}) - F(U(\tau) \cup \{1\}) - F(U(\tau) \cup \{2\}) + F(U(\tau)),$$

verifying that the MWCT reproduces the STII second-order operator as a tensor.

The essential reason the MWCT admits a TT representation lies in the fact that the information required to evaluate  $\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_{S,\tau}^{(k)}$  can be summarized by a small set of statistics derived from the prefix  $(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_i)$  rather than an explicit enumeration of subsets. Specifically, the computation requires only the cumulative count of indices  $j \leq i$  for which  $\tau_j = 1$ , indicator variables specifying whether elements of  $S$  appear in the prefix, and local quantities determining the parity structure of inclusion–exclusion. These can be updated recursively as the prefix grows.

Accordingly, the internal state at prefix length  $i$  can be written as

$$r_i = \left( c_i, b_i^{(p)}, b_i^{(q)} \right),$$

where  $c_i$  is the number of occurrences of  $\tau_j = 1$  in the first  $i$  positions, and  $b_i^{(p)}$  and  $b_i^{(q)}$  indicate whether the elements  $p$  and  $q$  of  $S = \{p, q\}$  appear in the prefix. These quantities suffice to determine the local contribution to the discrete derivative. The state evolution follows the deterministic update rule

$$r_i = g(r_{i-1}, \tau_i),$$

and the state space size is bounded by a polynomial in  $n_{\text{in}}$ . Consequently, the MWCT can be computed without enumerating subsets, relying instead on a polynomial-size state transition process. This ensures that the TT cores can be chosen with polynomial rank, enabling a TT representation.

This example demonstrates that the MWCT is computable solely through recursive prefix-based updates, rather than combinatorial subset enumeration. This property underlies its representation as a tensor-train chain and directly supports subsequent lemmas establishing that the TT ranks remain polynomial in  $n_{\text{in}}$ .

### 3.3. Computational Complexity and Scalability

This section establishes how the computational acceleration of IT-SHAP is achieved. The objective of the analysis is to demonstrate that IT-SHAP belongs to the complexity class  $\text{NC}^2$ . To this end, the argument proceeds through three components, as summarized in Figure 1.

The first component of the argument is presented in Lemma (4), which shows that the MWCT




Figure 1: Logical dependency among lemmas and the main theorem for IT-SHAP.

possesses a finite-state local transition structure and therefore admits a representation in TT form. The second component, given in Lemma (5), establishes that the TT cores associated with this representation have dimensions bounded by a polynomial in the feature dimension. Consequently, the TT ranks remain polynomial rather than exponential.

The third component combines these two lemmas to analyze the TT contraction process. Since TT contraction with polynomial ranks can be executed by parallel circuits of polylogarithmic depth, the overall computation of IT-SHAP is shown in Theorem (6) to lie in  $\text{NC}^2$ .

The following subsections examine each component, clarify its contribution to the overall result, and explain how the three components together establish the parallel computability of IT-SHAP.

### 3.3.1. General TN Structure

Under a general TN structure, the contraction operations required to compute the MST are known to be  $\#\text{P}$ -hard (Marzouk et al., 2025). Since IT-SHAP extends MST by incorporating higher-order derivatives and additional tensor contractions, its computation under a general TN structure inherits this hardness.

**Lemma 3** (IT-SHAP is  $\#\text{P}$ -hard under General TN Structure). *Assume that the model tensor  $\mathcal{T}^M$  and the background distribution tensor  $\mathcal{T}^P$  are represented by general TN structures. Then the computation of IT-SHAP is  $\#\text{P}$ -hard.*

### 3.3.2. TT Structure

To show that IT-SHAP is computable within the complexity class  $\text{NC}^2$  under a TT assumption, it is necessary to demonstrate that all tensor components involved admit TT representations with polynomially bounded ranks. As shown in Marzouk et al. (2025), contraction of TT tensors reduces to a chain of matrix multiplications, each computable in  $\text{NC}^1$ , and the full contraction can be arranged in logarithmic depth, yielding an  $\text{NC}^2$  computation.

In the present formulation, the only component not previously analyzed in MST is the MWCT. Hence, it suffices to establish that this tensor admits a TT representation and that its TT ranks grow at most polynomially.

We begin by establishing the existence of a TT representation.



**Lemma 4** (MWCT Admits a TT Representation). *Assume that the model tensor  $\mathcal{T}^M$  and the distribution tensor  $\mathcal{T}^P$  admit TT representations. Consider the MWCT defined for any subset  $S \subseteq N$  and routing index  $\tau \in \{1, 2\}^{n_{\text{in}}}$  by*

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_{S,\tau}^{(k)} = \sum_{W \subseteq S} (-1)^{|S|-|W|} \omega^{(k)}(W, \tau), \quad (16)$$

*and assume that there exist finite sets  $\mathcal{R}_0, \dots, \mathcal{R}_{n_{\text{in}}}$  and local weights  $w^{(i)} : \mathcal{R}_{i-1} \times \{1, 2\} \times \mathcal{R}_i \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that*

$$\omega^{(k)}(W, \tau) = \sum_{r_0, \dots, r_{n_{\text{in}}}} \prod_{i=1}^{n_{\text{in}}} w^{(i)}(r_{i-1}, \tau_i, r_i), \quad (17)$$

*where each  $r_i \in \mathcal{R}_i$ . Then  $\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}^{(k)}$  admits a complete TT representation.*

Lemma 4 establishes structural representability. We next show that this representation is efficiently bounded.

**Lemma 5** (Polynomial TT-Rank of the MWCT). *Assume Lemma 4. Further assume that the finite-state representation satisfies*

$$|\mathcal{R}_0| \leq n_{\text{in}}, \quad |\mathcal{R}_i| \leq n_{\text{in}}^2 \quad (1 \leq i \leq n_{\text{in}} - 1), \quad |\mathcal{R}_{n_{\text{in}}}| = 1.$$

*Then the TT representation of the MWCT  $\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}^{(k)}$  satisfies*

$$G^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{\text{in}} \times 2 \times n_{\text{in}}^2}, \quad G^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{\text{in}}^2 \times 2 \times n_{\text{in}}^2} \quad (2 \leq i \leq n_{\text{in}} - 1), \quad G^{(n_{\text{in}})} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{\text{in}}^2 \times 2}.$$

*In particular, all TT ranks are bounded by  $\mathcal{O}(n_{\text{in}}^2)$ .*

Lemma 5 establishes that the information required to compute the MWCT is determined solely by a small collection of statistics derived from the prefix of the routing sequence  $(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_i)$ . These statistics remain within a polynomial range with respect to the feature dimension  $n_{\text{in}}$ . Consequently, the ranks of the TT representation of the MWCT do not grow exponentially and can instead be bounded by a polynomial function of  $n_{\text{in}}$ . This property plays a central role in reducing the computational complexity associated with the MWCT.

The MWCT

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}^{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^{2^{n_{\text{in}}}}$$

is, in its explicit form, indexed over all subsets of  $[n_{\text{in}}]$  and thus exhibits an inherent exponential dimensionality. A direct representation therefore requires  $\Theta(2^{n_{\text{in}}})$  degrees of freedom. However, the value of  $\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}^{(k)}$  at any routing configuration is obtained by successive updates based solely on the prefix  $(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_i)$ . Hence, it is not necessary to store or enumerate all exponentially many combinations. The relevant statistics remain confined to a polynomial domain, and the entire MWCT can be encoded within a polynomial-size representation.

This structural property aligns naturally with the TT format. Each TT core of the MWCT can be represented with polynomially bounded ranks, and the memory and computational requirements of the TT representation are therefore reduced from exponential order to polynomial order. Moreover, the contraction operations required by the TT format are associative. This enables a parallel execution model analogous to a tree-based prefix-scan, thereby reducing the computational depth to a polylogarithmic scale, such as  $\text{NC}^2$ , while maintaining a polynomial amount of total work.

Taken together, the fact that the MWCT admits a TT representation with polynomial ranks is not merely a form of tensor compression. Rather, it constitutes a fundamental mechanism for reducing the exponential complexity inherent to the STII into polynomial time, and for further lowering the computational depth through parallelization to achieve practical computational efficiency.

Combining Lemma 4 and Lemma 5, we conclude that IT-SHAP is computable in  $\text{NC}^2$  under TT assumptions. The result is formalized below.

**Theorem 6** ( $\text{NC}^2$  Computability of IT-SHAP). *Assume the following conditions:*

- (A1) *The model tensor  $\mathcal{T}^M$  and the background-distribution tensor  $\mathcal{T}^P$  both admit TT representations whose TT ranks are bounded by a polynomial in the feature dimension  $D$  and the interaction order  $k$ .*
- (A2) *The Value Tensor  $V_{(M,P)}$  constructed from  $\mathcal{T}^M$  and  $\mathcal{T}^P$  therefore possesses a TT decomposition with polynomially bounded ranks.*
- (A3) *The MWCT satisfies the finite-state prefix representation of Lemma 4, and its TT ranks are bounded polynomially as guaranteed by Lemma 5.*
- (A4) *The TT decompositions of  $\mathcal{T}^M$ ,  $\mathcal{T}^P$ , and the MWCT are given as input; the cost of constructing these TT representations is not counted in the  $\text{NC}^2$  analysis.*
- (A5) *All TT ranks involved in the contraction*

$$\mathcal{T}^{(k)}(M, P) = \widetilde{\mathcal{W}}^{(k)} \times_S V_{(M,P)}$$

*are bounded by  $\text{poly}(D, k)$ , ensuring that each matrix multiplication in the TT chain is of polynomial size.*

*Under assumptions (A1)–(A5), any component  $\mathcal{T}^{(k)}(M, P)$  of IT-SHAP can be computed within the complexity class  $\text{NC}^2$  using parallel contraction of TT tensors with polynomially bounded ranks.*

### 3.4. Theoretical Relationship Between STII and IT-SHAP

This section provides a theoretical comparison between the combinatorial complexity inherent in STII and the manner in which IT-SHAP mitigates this complexity through its use of TT structure. The discussion focuses on the computational requirements imposed by each framework.

The definition of STII relies on the discrete derivative  $\delta_S F(T)$  and permutation-based averaging. Consequently, even when the interaction set  $S$  is fixed, the computation must enumerate all subsets  $T \subseteq [n_{\text{in}}] \setminus S$  and all subsets  $W \subseteq S$ . The total number of evaluations required is

$$2^{|S|} 2^{n_{\text{in}} - |S|} = 2^{n_{\text{in}}},$$

and evaluating all interaction sets of order at most  $k$ , denoted  $\mathcal{S}_k$ , incurs a total time complexity of

$$\Theta\left(2^{n_{\text{in}}} \cdot n_{\text{in}}^k\right).$$

In the worst case, when  $k = n_{\text{in}}$ , the complexity becomes

$$\Theta(4^{n_{\text{in}}}).$$

The space complexity required to store all values of  $F(S)$  is likewise  $\Theta(2^{n_{\text{in}}})$ . Therefore, the definition of STII imposes an intrinsic exponential blow-up in both time and space.

The origin of this exponential complexity is structural. STII evaluates the discrete derivative  $\delta_S F(T)$  by exhaustively traversing the subset lattice. The full enumeration of  $T \subseteq [n_{\text{in}}] \setminus S$  combined with the inclusion–exclusion expansion over  $W \subseteq S$  corresponds to exploring every node of a tree of depth  $n_{\text{in}}$ , whose total number of nodes is  $\Theta(2^{n_{\text{in}}})$ . Hence, STII is inherently exponential due to its dependence on subset-lattice exploration.

In contrast, IT-SHAP replaces this full subset enumeration with a recursive update based on prefixes of the routing index  $\tau \in \{1, 2\}^{n_{\text{in}}}$ . By scanning  $\tau$  from left to right, all quantities necessary for evaluating the discrete derivative—such as occurrence counts, membership indicators relative to the interaction set, and inclusion–exclusion signs—are determined solely from a finite internal state. Thus, all relevant information can be compressed into prefix states  $r_i$  updated by

$$r_i = g(r_{i-1}, \tau_i).$$

This structure reduces the exponential exploration of the subset lattice to a polynomial-sized state-transition system. This observation is fundamental to the fact that the MWCT can be represented in TT form with polynomial TT ranks.

IT-SHAP expresses the closed-form interaction quantity as a contraction between a Value Tensor and the MWCT. Let  $r_{\text{val}}$  denote the TT rank of the Value Tensor and  $r_{\text{wgt}}$  denote the TT rank of the MWCT. The TT rank of the resulting IT-SHAP tensor satisfies

$$r_{\text{IT}} \leq r_{\text{val}} r_{\text{wgt}}.$$

The prefix state in the MWCT reflects the information stored at each position  $i$  in the update rule above, and the size of this state space depends on the model structure and interaction order. While a general explicit upper bound need not exist, the use of TT representation ensures that all

Item	STII	IT-SHAP
Space complexity	$\Theta(2^{n_{\text{in}}})$	$\mathcal{O}(n_{\text{in}} r_{\text{IT}}^2)$
Time complexity	$\Theta(2^{n_{\text{in}}} \cdot n_{\text{in}}^k)$ (worst case $4^{n_{\text{in}}}$ )	$\mathcal{O}(n_{\text{in}} \cdot r_{\text{IT}}^3)$
TT rank	Exponential ( $2^{n_{\text{in}}}$ )	$r_{\text{IT}} \leq r_{\text{val}} r_{\text{wgt}}$
Parallel computation	Not feasible (exponential dependency)	$\text{NC}^2$ (depth $\mathcal{O}(\log n_{\text{in}})$ )
Essential complexity	Enumeration of discrete derivatives	TT contraction (rank-dependent)

**Table 1. Comparison of the computational complexity of STII and IT-SHAP.**

computations depend only on TT ranks rather than on exponential subset enumeration.

As shown in Marzouk et al. (2025), the MST can be efficiently manipulated through its TT representation, and the contraction can be computed in sequential time

$$\mathcal{O}(n_{\text{in}} r_{\text{val}}^3).$$

For the MWCT, the TT rank  $r_{\text{wgt}}$  depends on the structure of the interaction order  $k$ , and no universal polynomial upper bound is known.

The contraction of the Value Tensor and the MWCT yields an IT-SHAP tensor with sequential time complexity

$$\mathcal{O}(n_{\text{in}} (r_{\text{IT}})^3),$$

and space complexity

$$\mathcal{O}(n_{\text{in}} (r_{\text{IT}})^2).$$

Moreover, since TT contraction can be implemented with parallel prefix-scan techniques of depth  $\mathcal{O}(\log n_{\text{in}})$ , IT-SHAP belongs to the complexity class  $\text{NC}^2$  whenever the TT ranks remain fixed or bounded by a polynomial.

In summary, STII inevitably exhibits exponential complexity due to its dependence on explicit subset-lattice traversal, whereas IT-SHAP avoids exponential enumeration by relying on TT representations whose computational cost depends solely on TT ranks. The efficiency of IT-SHAP thus hinges on the magnitude of these ranks, which depend on the structure of the underlying model and cannot be universally upper bounded by a polynomial.

## 4. Discussion

This paper proposes a theoretical framework that unifies Shapley-based main effects and higher-order interactions within a single tensor-network representation. Existing approaches exhibit complementary strengths and limitations: STII provides a closed-form expression for interactions of arbitrary order but incurs exponential computational cost due to discrete derivatives, while MST efficiently computes first-order contributions when the underlying tensors admit a TT structure but lacks a principled extension to higher-order interactions. The present study establishes a bridge

between these two approaches and introduces Interaction Tensor SHAP (IT-SHAP), a framework that captures Shapley-type contributions, including higher-order interactions, as structured tensor-network contractions.

The first component of our contribution is the reconstruction of STII as a contraction between a Value Tensor and a Weight Tensor. This formulation expresses the computational structure of STII as a chain of tensor operations rather than as enumeration over subsets. Consequently, computations that traditionally required exponential enumeration can be reformulated as local update rules within a NT. A key observation is that the combinatorial structure of the Weight Tensor admits an encoding in terms of finitely many local states determined by prefixes of the routing sequence. This observation guarantees the theoretical compatibility between STII and TT representations.

The second component is the construction of a Weight Tensor that captures the STII weighting mechanism in TT form. The TT rank of this tensor depends on the interaction order  $k$  and on the local state transitions induced by prefixes of the routing sequence. We show that this Weight Tensor can be expressed as a finite-rank TT decomposition whose rank is determined by the model structure and the specified interaction order. This provides a theoretical foundation for viewing the closed-form STII expression as a TT contraction.

Building on this representation, we derive complexity bounds for IT-SHAP. Prior work demonstrates that MST can be efficiently represented in TT form with TT rank  $r_{\text{val}}$  (Marzouk et al., 2025). Let  $r_{\text{wgt}}$  denote the TT rank of the Weight Tensor. Then the TT rank of IT-SHAP satisfies

$$r_{\text{IT}} \leq r_{\text{val}} r_{\text{wgt}}.$$

It follows that the space complexity of IT-SHAP is

$$\mathcal{O}(n_{\text{in}} \cdot r_{\text{IT}}^2),$$

and the sequential time complexity is

$$\mathcal{O}(n_{\text{in}} \cdot r_{\text{IT}}^3).$$

Moreover, because TT contractions can be executed using parallel prefix-scan procedures with circuit depth  $\mathcal{O}(\log n_{\text{in}})$ , the computation of IT-SHAP belongs to  $\text{NC}^2$  under bounded-rank assumptions.

Several assumptions and limitations accompany this formulation. The framework requires that the Value Tensor  $F$  be provided in TT form. Although any tensor can theoretically be decomposed into TT format, constructing the decomposition is computationally demanding, and the TT rank may grow exponentially depending on the data distribution and model structure (Oseledets, 2011). Consequently, when TT ranks are large, the theoretical advantage of  $\text{NC}^2$  computation may not translate into practical efficiency. Nonetheless, recent developments in TT decomposition provide promising mitigation. Randomized TT-SVD (Huber et al., 2018), TensorSketch-based acceleration of ALS (Chen et al., 2023), and leverage-score-based TT-ALS (Bharadwaj et al., 2024) can significantly lower the construction cost of both the Value Tensor and the Weight Tensor. Integrating

such methods into IT-SHAP may enable applications to larger and more complex datasets.

This framework also bears important implications for Explainable AI. Interpreting large-scale black-box models requires understanding not only individual feature contributions but also higher-order interactions among multiple features. Historically, analyzing such interactions has been computationally prohibitive due to exponential complexity (Kleinau et al., 2025). IT-SHAP addresses this challenge by decomposing the STII interaction structure into an explicit tensor-network representation and exploiting TT-based parallel computation to avoid exponential enumeration. As a result, complex interaction patterns within high-dimensional models can be analyzed at practical computational cost, laying the groundwork for higher-order interaction-aware XAI.

The theoretical foundation presented in this paper highlights several promising research directions. One direction is the analysis of how model structure and background distributions influence TT rank and the characterization of conditions under which rank inflation occurs. Another direction concerns the semantic interpretation of higher-order interactions, for which a principled interpretability framework is needed. A further direction is error analysis of how uncertainty in the background distribution propagates through the Value Tensor and affects final interaction estimates. Extending the framework to other tensor formats such as Tucker and CP is also a natural continuation. Finally, developing hybrid XAI pipelines that integrate exact and approximate computation may yield practical methods for handling higher-order interactions under limited computational resources.

## 5. Conclusion

This paper proposed Interaction Tensor SHAP (IT-SHAP) as a general framework for jointly representing main effects and higher-order interactions defined by Shapley-based principles. By reformulating the closed form of STII as a contraction between a Value Tensor and a weight tensor, this study demonstrated that interaction computations that previously required exponential complexity can be expressed as polynomial-time operations under TT structure. Moreover, IT-SHAP was shown to satisfy the four classical Shapley axioms together with the Interaction Distribution Axiom, thereby establishing IT-SHAP as the unique index capable of evaluating both main effects and higher-order interactions within a single tensor-network formulation.

The results further established that IT-SHAP lies in the complexity class  $\text{NC}^2$  when parallel processors are available. This classification follows from the fact that TT contractions admit parallel prefix-scan implementations of logarithmic depth. Given that the worst-case computational complexity of STII is  $\Theta(4^{n_{\text{in}}})$ , the reduction to  $\text{NC}^2$  constitutes a substantial theoretical and computational improvement. Consequently, the proposed framework provides a structurally coherent approach to addressing a central challenge in XAI: achieving both axiomatic rigor and computational tractability in the analysis of higher-order interactions.

Several directions for future work remain open. These include deriving sharper upper bounds on TT ranks, clarifying how model structure influences rank growth, and developing a theoretical account of the interpretability of higher-order interactions. The framework introduced in this study

forms a foundation for designing interaction-based explanation methods for a wide range of black-box models, including deep neural networks, and offers a path toward scalable and theoretically grounded higher-order XAI techniques.

## 6. Acknowledgement

This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 23K22166.

## Appendix

### 6.1. Proof of Lemma 2

*Proof.* We begin by defining the value function  $F_{\mathbf{x},y}: 2^{[n_{\text{in}}]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  according to (6) as

$$F_{\mathbf{x},y}(S) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}' \sim P} [M_y(\mathbf{x}_S, \mathbf{x}'_{S^c})], \quad S \subseteq [n_{\text{in}}].$$

Under this definition, each component of the MST is given by the Shapley-value formula

$$\text{MST}(M, P)_{\mathbf{x},i,y} = \sum_{T \subseteq [n_{\text{in}}] \setminus \{i\}} \omega_{\text{Shap}}(T) (F_{\mathbf{x},y}(T \cup \{i\}) - F_{\mathbf{x},y}(T)), \quad (18)$$

where

$$\omega_{\text{Shap}}(T) = \frac{|T|! (n_{\text{in}} - |T| - 1)!}{n_{\text{in}}!}$$

is the standard Shapley kernel.

We next substitute  $k = 1$  and  $S = \{i\}$  into the closed form of STII (7). From the discrete derivative definition (8), for every  $T \subseteq [n_{\text{in}}] \setminus \{i\}$  we obtain

$$\delta_{\{i\}} F_{\mathbf{x},y}(T) = F_{\mathbf{x},y}(T \cup \{i\}) - F_{\mathbf{x},y}(T).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} I_{\{i\}}^{(1)}(F_{\mathbf{x},y}) &= \frac{1}{n_{\text{in}}} \sum_{T \subseteq [n_{\text{in}}] \setminus \{i\}} \frac{\delta_{\{i\}} F_{\mathbf{x},y}(T)}{\binom{n_{\text{in}}-1}{|T|}} \\ &= \sum_{T \subseteq [n_{\text{in}}] \setminus \{i\}} \left( \frac{1}{n_{\text{in}}} \cdot \frac{1}{\binom{n_{\text{in}}-1}{|T|}} \right) (F_{\mathbf{x},y}(T \cup \{i\}) - F_{\mathbf{x},y}(T)). \end{aligned}$$

A direct simplification of the coefficient yields

$$\frac{1}{n_{\text{in}}} \cdot \frac{1}{\binom{n_{\text{in}}-1}{|T|}} = \omega_{\text{Shap}}(T),$$

which gives the identity

$$I_{\{i\}}^{(1)}(F_{\mathbf{x},y}) = \sum_{T \subseteq [n_{\text{in}}] \setminus \{i\}} \omega_{\text{Shap}}(T) (F_{\mathbf{x},y}(T \cup \{i\}) - F_{\mathbf{x},y}(T)). \quad (19)$$

Thus, STII with  $k = 1$  coincides with the Shapley value for each singleton index set.

We now recall the embedding of the value function into the Value Tensor. From (10),

$$\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{x},\tau,y}^{(M,P)} = F_{\mathbf{x},y}(S(\tau)), \quad S(\tau) = \{j : \tau_j = 1\}.$$

With the weight tensor components defined by  $\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_{S,\tau}^{(k)} = \alpha_S^{(k)}(\tau)$ , equation (13) gives

$$I_S^{(k)}(F_{\mathbf{x},y}) = \sum_{\tau \in \{1,2\}^{n_{\text{in}}}} \widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_{S,\tau}^{(k)} \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{x},\tau,y}^{(M,P)}.$$

This coincides with the component representation of the tensor contraction

$$\mathcal{T}^{(k)}(M, P) = \widetilde{\mathcal{W}}^{(k)} \times_2 \mathcal{V}^{(M,P)}.$$

In particular,

$$\mathcal{T}^{(k)}(M, P)_{\mathbf{x},S,y} = I_S^{(k)}(F_{\mathbf{x},y}).$$

Applying this identity with  $k = 1$  and  $S = \{i\}$  yields

$$\mathcal{T}^{(1)}(M, P)_{\mathbf{x},\{i\},y} = I_{\{i\}}^{(1)}(F_{\mathbf{x},y}),$$

and by comparing (19) with (18), we see that this quantity is exactly the MST component  $\text{MST}(M, P)_{\mathbf{x},i,y}$ .

Finally, for first-order interactions we have  $\mathcal{S}_1 = \{\{1\}, \dots, \{n_{\text{in}}\}\}$ , and the identification  $\{i\} \leftrightarrow i$  yields

$$\mathcal{T}^{(1)}(M, P) \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{D} \times |\mathcal{S}_1| \times n_{\text{out}}} \cong \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{D} \times n_{\text{in}} \times n_{\text{out}}},$$

which coincides with the size of the MST.

This establishes that the IT-SHAP tensor defined in Theorem 1 coincides componentwise with the MST when  $k = 1$ . ■

## 6.2. Proof of Lemma 3

*Proof.* We first show that, for any fixed integer  $k \geq 1$ , the first-order component  $\mathcal{T}^{(1)}(M, P)$  can be extracted from  $\mathcal{T}^{(k)}(M, P)$  in polynomial time. From Theorem 1, the order- $k$  IT-SHAP tensor

$$\mathcal{T}^{(k)}(M, P) \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{D} \times |\mathcal{S}_k| \times n_{\text{out}}}$$

is indexed along its second mode by the collection

$$\mathcal{S}_k = \{S \subseteq [n_{\text{in}}] : |S| \leq k\}.$$



Since  $k$  is a constant,

$$|\mathcal{S}_k| = \sum_{j=0}^k \binom{n_{\text{in}}}{j} = \mathcal{O}(n_{\text{in}}^k),$$

and therefore  $\mathcal{S}_k$  can be enumerated in polynomial time.

For any  $i \in [n_{\text{in}}]$ , the singleton set  $\{i\}$  is necessarily contained in  $\mathcal{S}_k$  whenever  $k \geq 1$ . Thus, by enumerating  $\mathcal{S}_k$ , we may identify in polynomial time the index  $s(i)$  corresponding to  $\{i\}$  along the second mode. We then define

$$\mathcal{T}^{(1)}(M, P)_{x, \{i\}, y} := \mathcal{T}^{(k)}(M, P)_{x, s(i), y},$$

which extracts the first-order component by direct tensor entry access. Hence, the construction of  $\mathcal{T}^{(1)}(M, P)$  from  $\mathcal{T}^{(k)}(M, P)$  requires only polynomial time.

We now turn to the hardness argument. For  $k = 1$ , Lemma 2 shows that  $\mathcal{T}^{(1)}(M, P)$  coincides componentwise with the MST. Marzouk et al. (2025) establish that computing MST under a general TN structure is  $\#P$ -hard. Therefore,

IT-SHAP(1) is  $\#P$ -hard.

Moreover, by the polynomial-time extraction procedure described above, we have

$$\text{IT-SHAP}(1) \leq_p \text{IT-SHAP}(k) \quad \text{for every fixed } k \geq 1,$$

where  $A \leq_p B$  denotes polynomial-time many-one reducibility. Since IT-SHAP(1) is  $\#P$ -hard and reduces to IT-SHAP( $k$ ), it follows that IT-SHAP( $k$ ) is also  $\#P$ -hard for every fixed  $k \geq 1$ .

This establishes the claim of Lemma 3. ■

### 6.3. Proof of Lemma 4

*Proof.* We begin by substituting the definitions in (16) and (17). For any  $S \subseteq N$  and any  $\tau \in \{1, 2\}^{n_{\text{in}}}$ , these relations yield

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_{S, \tau}^{(k)} = \sum_{W \subseteq S} (-1)^{|S| - |W|} \left( \sum_{r_0, \dots, r_{n_{\text{in}}}} \prod_{i=1}^{n_{\text{in}}} w^{(i)}(r_{i-1}, \tau_i, r_i) \right) \quad (20)$$

$$= \sum_{r_0, \dots, r_{n_{\text{in}}}} \left( \sum_{W \subseteq S} (-1)^{|S| - |W|} \right) \prod_{i=1}^{n_{\text{in}}} w^{(i)}(r_{i-1}, \tau_i, r_i). \quad (21)$$

The coefficient

$$c_S = \sum_{W \subseteq S} (-1)^{|S| - |W|}$$

depends only on  $S$  and is independent of the internal states. Consequently, for fixed  $S$ , the quantity  $\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_{S,\tau}^{(k)}$  can be written as

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_{S,\tau}^{(k)} = \sum_{r_0, \dots, r_{n_{\text{in}}}} \prod_{i=1}^{n_{\text{in}}} \widetilde{w}_S^{(i)}(r_{i-1}, \tau_i, r_i),$$

where the local weights  $\widetilde{w}_S^{(i)}$  are defined so that the factor  $c_S$  is evenly distributed across modes, for example by

$$\widetilde{w}_S^{(i)}(r_{i-1}, \tau_i, r_i) = c_S^{1/n_{\text{in}}} w^{(i)}(r_{i-1}, \tau_i, r_i).$$

We compare this representation with the standard TT definition. Let  $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times \dots \times n_{n_{\text{in}}}}$  be a tensor in TT form. Its TT expansion is given by

$$\mathcal{X}_{\text{TT}}(\tau) = \sum_{r_0, \dots, r_{n_{\text{in}}}} \prod_{i=1}^{n_{\text{in}}} \mathcal{G}_{r_{i-1}, \tau_i, r_i}^{(i)}, \quad (22)$$

where each core satisfies

$$\mathcal{G}^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^{r_{i-1} \times n_i \times r_i}.$$

In the present setting, the MWCT index  $\tau$  ranges over  $\{1, 2\}^{n_{\text{in}}}$ , hence  $n_i = 2$  for all modes, and the internal indices satisfy  $r_i \in \mathcal{R}_i$ . Thus, by defining the TT cores as

$$\mathcal{G}_{r_{i-1}, \tau_i, r_i}^{(i)} := \widetilde{w}_S^{(i)}(r_{i-1}, \tau_i, r_i),$$

the right-hand side of (21) coincides with the right-hand side of (22).

Therefore,

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_{S,\tau}^{(k)} = \mathcal{X}_{\text{TT}}(\tau)$$

for all  $S$  and  $\tau$ , and the MWCT is representable exactly in TT form. This completes the proof.  $\blacksquare$

#### 6.4. Proof of Lemma 5

*Proof.* Lemma 4 establishes that whenever the local weights  $\omega^{(k)}(W, \tau)$  admit the finite-state representation in (17), the MWCT  $\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}^{(k)}$  admits a TT representation of the form

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}^{(k)}(\tau) = \sum_{r_0, \dots, r_{n_{\text{in}}}} \prod_{i=1}^{n_{\text{in}}} \mathcal{G}_{r_{i-1}, \tau_i, r_i}^{(i)}.$$

Given the internal state spaces  $\mathcal{R}_0, \dots, \mathcal{R}_{n_{\text{in}}}$ , the  $i$ -th TT core has size

$$\mathcal{G}^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{R}_{i-1}| \times 2 \times |\mathcal{R}_i|}. \quad (23)$$

The lemma's assumption provides explicit upper bounds on the internal state spaces:

$$|\mathcal{R}_0| \leq n_{\text{in}}, \quad |\mathcal{R}_i| \leq n_{\text{in}}^2 \quad (1 \leq i \leq n_{\text{in}} - 1), \quad |\mathcal{R}_{n_{\text{in}}}| = 1. \quad (24)$$

Combining (23) and (24) allows us to evaluate the explicit size of each TT core.

For  $i = 1$ , we obtain

$$\mathcal{G}^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{R}_0| \times 2 \times |\mathcal{R}_1|} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_{\text{in}} \times 2 \times n_{\text{in}}^2}.$$

For each  $2 \leq i \leq n_{\text{in}} - 1$ , we have

$$\mathcal{G}^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{R}_{i-1}| \times 2 \times |\mathcal{R}_i|} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_{\text{in}}^2 \times 2 \times n_{\text{in}}^2}.$$

For  $i = n_{\text{in}}$ , the terminal state constraint  $|\mathcal{R}_{n_{\text{in}}}| = 1$  yields

$$\mathcal{G}^{(n_{\text{in}})} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{R}_{n_{\text{in}}-1}| \times 2 \times 1} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_{\text{in}}^2 \times 2}.$$

Defining

$$G^{(1)} := \mathcal{G}^{(1)}, \quad G^{(i)} := \mathcal{G}^{(i)} \quad (2 \leq i \leq n_{\text{in}} - 1), \quad G^{(n_{\text{in}})} := \mathcal{G}^{(n_{\text{in}})},$$

we obtain the explicit bounds

$$G^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{\text{in}} \times 2 \times n_{\text{in}}^2}, \quad G^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{\text{in}}^2 \times 2 \times n_{\text{in}}^2} \quad (2 \leq i \leq n_{\text{in}} - 1), \quad G^{(n_{\text{in}})} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{\text{in}}^2 \times 2}.$$

Finally, we evaluate the TT ranks. Since the  $i$ -th TT rank is given by

$$r_i = |\mathcal{R}_i|,$$

the bounds in (24) imply

$$r_0 \leq n_{\text{in}}, \quad r_i \leq n_{\text{in}}^2 \quad (1 \leq i \leq n_{\text{in}} - 1), \quad r_{n_{\text{in}}} = 1.$$

Thus, every TT rank is bounded above by  $n_{\text{in}}^2$ . Consequently, all TT ranks of the MWCT  $\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}^{(k)}$  are uniformly bounded by  $\mathcal{O}(n_{\text{in}}^2)$ , which completes the proof.  $\blacksquare$

### 6.5. Proof of Theorem 6

*Proof.* Lemma 4 shows that the MWCT  $\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}^{(k)}$  admits a TT representation. Moreover, Lemma 5 ensures that the internal state spaces  $\mathcal{R}_0, \dots, \mathcal{R}_D$  of its TT cores satisfy

$$|\mathcal{R}_0| \leq D, \quad |\mathcal{R}_i| \leq D^2 \quad (1 \leq i \leq D - 1), \quad |\mathcal{R}_D| = 1.$$

Consequently, the maximum TT rank of  $\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}^{(k)}$  is bounded by  $r_{\text{MWCT}} \leq D^2$ .

On the other hand, Proposition 3 of Marzouk et al. (2025) establishes that the Marginal Value Tensor  $\mathcal{V}^{(k)}(M, P)$  has TT rank bounded by a polynomial in  $D$  and  $k$ , and that its TT contraction can be computed within the complexity class NC<sup>2</sup>.

The value tensor of IT-Tensor SHAP is obtained by contracting the MWCT and the Marginal

Value Tensor:

$$\mathcal{T}^{(k)}(M, P) = \widetilde{\mathcal{W}}^{(k)} \times_S \mathcal{V}^{(k)}(M, P).$$

From standard properties of TT contraction, the resulting TT rank  $r_{\text{IT}}$  satisfies

$$r_{\text{IT}} \leq r_{\text{MWCT}} \cdot r_{\text{MV}} \leq D^2 \cdot \text{poly}(D, k) = \text{poly}(D, k).$$

Thus,  $\mathcal{T}^{(k)}(M, P)$  also admits a TT representation whose ranks are polynomially bounded in  $D$  and  $k$ .

Finally, computing any entry of a tensor represented in TT form reduces to selecting the appropriate mode slices and performing a sequence of matrix multiplications. Since matrix multiplication is in  $\text{NC}^1$  and a matrix chain product can be evaluated via parallel prefix-scan in  $\text{NC}^2$ , the computation of any component  $\mathcal{T}^{(k)}(M, P)_\sigma$  can be carried out within  $\text{NC}^2$ , as shown in Marzouk et al. (2025).

Therefore, every component of the IT-Tensor SHAP value tensor is computable in the complexity class  $\text{NC}^2$ . ■

## References

- Lundberg, S. M., and Lee, S.-I. (2017), *A unified approach to interpreting model predictions*, Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 30.
- Mosca, E., Szigeti, F., Tragianni, S., Gallagher, D., and Groh, G. (2022), *SHAP-based explanation methods: a review for NLP interpretability*, Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Computational Linguistics, 4593–4603.
- Lundberg, S. M., Erion, G., Chen, H., DeGrave, A., Prutkin, J. M., Nair, B., Katz, R., Himmelfarb, J., Bansal, N., and Lee, S.-I. (2020), *From local explanations to global understanding with explainable AI for trees*, Nature Machine Intelligence, 2(1), 56–67.
- Marzouk, R., Bassan, S., and Katz, G. (2025), *SHAP Meets Tensor Networks: Provably Tractable Explanations with Parallelism*, Proceedings of the 39th Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems.
- Sundararajan, M., Dhamdhere, K., and Agarwal, A. (2020), *The Shapley Taylor Interaction Index*, International Conference on Machine Learning, 9259–9268.
- Bachmann, S. (2025), *Efficient XAI: A Low-Cost Data Reduction Approach to SHAP Interpretability*, Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research, 83.
- Aas, K., Jullum, M., and Løland, A. (2021), *Explaining individual predictions when features are dependent: More accurate approximations to Shapley values*, Artificial Intelligence, 298, 103502.

- Olsen, L. H. B., Glad, I. K., Jullum, M., and Aas, K. (2022), *Using Shapley values and variational autoencoders to explain predictive models with dependent mixed features*, Journal of Machine Learning Research, 23(213), 1–51.
- Arenas, M., Barceló, P., Bertossi, L., and Monet, M. (2023), *On the complexity of SHAP-score-based explanations: Tractability via knowledge compilation and non-approximability results*, Journal of Machine Learning Research, 24(63), 1–58.
- Owen, G. (1972), *Multilinear extensions of games*, Management Science, 18(5-part-2), 64–79.
- Grabisch, M., and Roubens, M. (1999), *An axiomatic approach to the concept of interaction among players in cooperative games*, International Journal of Game Theory, 28(4), 547–565.
- Fumagalli, F., Muschalik, M., Kolpaczki, P., Hüllermeier, E., and Hammer, B. (2023), *SHAP-IQ: Unified approximation of any-order Shapley interactions*, Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 36, 11515–11551.
- Kolpaczki, P., Muschalik, M., Fumagalli, F., Hammer, B., and Huellermeier, E. (2024), *SVARM-IQ: Efficient Approximation of Any-order Shapley Interactions through Stratification*, Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics, 238.
- Kolda, T. G., and Bader, B. W. (2009), *Tensor decompositions and applications*, SIAM Review, 51(3), 455–500.
- Arora, S., and Barak, B. (2009), *Computational Complexity: A Modern Approach*, Cambridge University Press.
- Cook, S. A. (2023), *Towards a complexity theory of synchronous parallel computation*, In Logic, Automata, and Computational Complexity: The Works of Stephen A. Cook, 219–244.
- Ladner, R. E., and Fischer, M. J. (1980), *Parallel prefix computation*, Journal of the ACM, 27(4), 831–848.
- Valiant, L. G., and Skyum, S. (1981), *Fast parallel computation of polynomials using few processors*, International Symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science, 132–139.
- Huber, B., Schneider, R., and Wolf, S. (2018), *A randomized tensor train singular value decomposition*, Compressed Sensing and its Applications: Second International MATHEON Conference, 261–290.
- Chen, Z., Jiang, H., Yu, G., and Qi, L. (2023), *Low-rank tensor train decomposition using TensorSketch*, arXiv:2309.08093.
- Bharadwaj, V., Rakhshan, B. T., Malik, O. A., and Rabusseau, G. (2024), *Efficient leverage score sampling for tensor train decomposition*, Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 37, 73726–73744.

- Kleinau, A., Preim, B., and Meuschke, M. (2025), *FINCH: Locally Visualizing Higher-Order Feature Interactions in Black Box Models*, arXiv:2503.16445.
- Ribeiro, M. T., Singh, S., and 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.
- Doshi-Velez, F., and Kim, B. (2017), *Towards a rigorous science of interpretable machine learning*, arXiv:1702.08608.
- Guidotti, R., Monreale, A., Ruggieri, S., Turini, F., Giannotti, F., and Pedreschi, D. (2018), *A survey of methods for explaining black box models*, ACM Computing Surveys, 51(5), 1–42.
- Oseledets, I. V. (2011), *Tensor-train decomposition*, SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing, 33(5), 2295–2317.