

Towards Data Valuation via Asymmetric Data Shapley

Xi Zheng* Xiangyu Chang† Ruoxi Jia‡ Yong Tan§

November 4, 2024

Abstract

As data emerges as a vital driver of technological and economic advancements, a key challenge is accurately quantifying its value in algorithmic decision-making. The Shapley value, a well-established concept from cooperative game theory, has been widely adopted to assess the contribution of individual data sources in supervised machine learning. However, its symmetry axiom assumes all players in the cooperative game are homogeneous, which overlooks the complex structures and dependencies present in real-world datasets. To address this limitation, we extend the traditional data Shapley framework to asymmetric data Shapley, making it flexible enough to incorporate inherent structures within the datasets for structure-aware data valuation. We also introduce an efficient k -nearest neighbor-based algorithm for its exact computation. We demonstrate the practical applicability of our framework across various machine learning tasks and data market contexts. The code is available at: <https://github.com/xzheng01/Asymmetric-Data-Shapley>.

1 Introduction

Data valuation, which measures the contribution of individual data source on machine learning (ML) model performance, plays a crucial role in improving algorithmic transparency and creating incentive mechanisms for data sharing and monetization (Liu et al., 2023). Its importance is particularly evident in sectors like healthcare and finance, where explainable ML is increasingly being adopted for high-stake decision-making (Sahoh and Choksuriwong, 2023). The recent rise of data marketplaces further highlights the need for accurate data valuation (Ghorbani and Zou, 2019; Jia et al., 2019a). By integrating diverse data sources, these marketplaces enhance ML tasks and unlock significant business values (Agarwal et al., 2019). Fair compensation for data creators based on the value of their data is crucial in such contexts, making the equitable valuation of data a key issue (Altman, 2023).

Data Shapley has recently gained widespread recognition for quantifying the contribution of individual data points to ML models (Ghorbani and Zou, 2019; Jia et al., 2019b). It is uniquely defined by four axioms (see Axiom 2.1-2.4 in Section 2). However, its symmetry axiom evaluates all data points equally, based solely on their content and influence on model performance, overlooking any

*University of Washington; email: xzheng01@uw.edu.

†Xi’an Jiaotong University; email: xiangyuchang@xjtu.edu.cn.

‡Virginia Tech; email: ruoxijia@vt.edu.

§University of Washington; email: ytan@uw.edu.

inherent structures that exist in real-world datasets. This can lead to misleading and counterintuitive valuations in certain situations. We will further explore these counterintuitive outcomes in Section 3. To underscore the importance of incorporating the inherent structures within datasets into data valuation, we present the following examples.

Example 1.1 (Valuation of Augmented Data). *Data augmentation techniques expand the original training dataset to mitigate overfitting and improve performance (Shorten and Khoshgoftaar, 2019). However, since augmented data is generated from the original dataset through minor modifications, it often carries redundant information already present in the original dataset. Therefore, it is essential to assess the incremental value each augmented point contributes rather than focusing solely on its overall content. So how can we quantify the additional value each augmented data point brings to the original training set?*

Example 1.2 (Valuation of Sequential Data). *Many modern ML applications involve data streams, where data instances arrive sequentially, one at a time (Yasumoto et al., 2016). The traditional data Shapley method treats all training data points as homogeneous players, disregarding the chronological dependencies between these points in a stream. So how can we incorporate the chronological order to quantify the incremental value of each newly arrived data point in a stream, given all previously arrived data?*

Example 1.3 (Fair Allocation among Dependent Entities in Data Marketplace). *Traditional Shapley-based methods assume a simple market where multiple data creators fully own the training dataset (Jia et al., 2019a). However, these methods encounter challenges when data ownership is distributed across different, interdependent entities. For instance, consider a scenario where multiple data creators own the raw data, and a third-party data packager aggregates, refines the raw dataset, and sells the final model (see Figure 1). Data creators provide raw data, and the data packager adds value through processing. How, then, can we fairly allocate monetary value among the data creators and the data packager?*




Figure 1: Overview of the data market framework involving multiple data creators, a data packager, and a buyer.

Addressing these questions necessitates incorporating inherent structures among data points into their valuation. We present the first study to use asymmetric Shapley value for data valuation in

supervised machine learning. Our approach relaxes the symmetry axiom in the traditional data Shapley framework, thereby offering the flexibility to incorporate inherent structures within the sample space for structure-aware data valuation. Our contributions are summarized as follows:

- We propose a novel data valuation framework called asymmetric data Shapley. Utilizing ordered partitions and weighted systems, this framework addresses the limitations of classical data Shapley by incorporating the inherent structures among data points into their valuation.
- We provide a rigorous mathematical formulation for asymmetric data Shapley under general weight systems, including the intra-class uniform weight systems (ICU-WS) tailored for specific data valuation tasks. Theorems and propositions validate the class-wise efficiency of asymmetric data Shapley under ICU-WS, ensuring that the sum of data values in each social class reflects the incremental performance gain attributed to that class.
- We develop two efficient algorithms—one based on a Monte Carlo approach and the other on a KNN surrogate method—for approximating and accurately computing asymmetric data Shapley.
- We demonstrate the effectiveness of our approach in enhancing data valuation for tasks including augmented data valuation, sequential data valuation, and fair allocation in data marketplaces.

2 Background and Related Work

Shapley value for data valuation. Shapley value, a core concept in cooperative game theory, provides a unique allocation for distributing value among players in a coalitional game (Shapley et al., 1953). It has recently been adapted for data valuation in supervised machine learning to quantify the contribution of each data point to ML models (Ghorbani and Zou, 2019; Tang et al., 2021; Ghorbani et al., 2020; Jia et al., 2019b; Pandl et al., 2021; Schoch et al., 2022). The classical framework, known as the data Shapley (Ghorbani and Zou, 2019), considers a training dataset $D = \{z_i = (x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ and a learning algorithm \mathcal{A} , which is a function that takes the training dataset as input and returns a predictor. The score function $v(\cdot)$ accepts the predictor as input and outputs a score. We denote by $v(S, \mathcal{A})$ or $v(S)$ the score of the predictor trained on any $S \subseteq D$. For instance, if \mathcal{A} is a KNN classifier and $v(\cdot)$ is the accuracy on a separate test set D_{test} , then $v(S)$ corresponds to the test accuracy of the model trained on S . Data valuation aims to compute a value $\phi_i(v, D) \in \mathbb{R}$ that quantifies the contribution of each datum $z_i \in D$ to the model. The data Shapley (Ghorbani and Zou, 2019) framework suggests the data values must satisfy the following four axioms to ensure fairness.

Axiom 2.1 (Efficiency). $\sum_{i=1}^n \phi_i(v, D) = v(D) - v(\emptyset)$.

Axiom 2.2 (Linearity). For any score function u, v and $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$, $\phi_i(\alpha u + \beta v, D) = \alpha \phi_i(u, D) + \beta \phi_i(v, D)$.

Axiom 2.3 (Nullity). If for any $z_i \in D$ and any $S \subseteq D \setminus \{z_i\}$, $v(S \cup \{z_i\}) = v(S)$ holds, then $\phi_i(v, D) = 0$.

Axiom 2.4 (Symmetry). If for datum $z_i, z_j \in D$ and any $S \subseteq D \setminus \{z_i, z_j\}$, $v(S \cup \{z_i\}) = v(S \cup \{z_j\})$ holds, then $\phi_i(v, D) = \phi_j(v, D)$.

In cooperative game theory (Shapley et al., 1953), the value that satisfies Axiom 2.1-2.4 has the unique form:

$$\phi_i(v, D) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{s=1}^{n-1} \sum_{\substack{S \subseteq D \setminus \{z_i\} \\ |S|=s}} \binom{n-1}{s}^{-1} [v(S \cup \{z_i\}) - v(S)], \quad (1)$$

where $|S|$ is the cardinality of S . $\phi_i(v, D)$ is called the *data Shapley* of z_i . Moreover, this value $\phi_i(v, D)$ can be written as the equivalent form:

$$\phi_i(v, D) = \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\pi \in \Pi(D)} [v(\pi^i \cup \{z_i\}) - v(\pi^i)], \quad (2)$$

where $\pi \in \Pi(D)$ is any possible permutation of points in D and π^i is the set of all predecessors of z_i in permutation π . Therefore, $v(\pi^i \cup \{z_i\}) - v(\pi^i)$ is the marginal contribution of z_i in π , and the data Shapley of z_i is its average marginal contribution across all permutations.

Variations of Shapley value. The classical Shapley value is founded on Axioms 2.1-2.4, but these axioms may not hold in practice, leading to several variations of Shapley value. For instance, the semi-value relaxes the efficiency axiom (Dubey and Weber, 1977; NEYMAN and RJ, 1981; Ridaoui et al., 2018), whereas the quasi-value (or weighted value) relaxes the symmetry axiom (Kalai and Samet, 1987; Nowak and Radzik, 1995). Monderer and Samet (2002) offers a comprehensive review of these variations. Their applications in ML include the Beta Shapley (Kwon and Zou, 2021) and the WeightedSHAP (Kwon and Zou, 2022). Frye et al. (2020) explored relaxing the symmetry axiom to incorporate causal structures in the feature space, thus enhancing ML explainability. Despite these advances, no study has yet examined the benefits of relaxing the symmetry axiom within the sample space for data valuation tasks. Our work seeks to address this gap.

3 Counterintuition of Data Shapley

Data Shapley relies on the symmetry axiom, which equally distributes value among identically informative data points. However, this assumption becomes problematic in the presence of redundancy. Consider a simple scenario where the original training dataset D is combined with an exact replication D' to train an ML model. Due to the symmetry axiom, identical values are assigned to each datum in D and its replication in D' . This identical attribution, however, overlooks any underlying structures between the original and redundant data, thus limiting its practical applicability. We explicitly demonstrate this in Lemma 3.1.

Lemma 3.1 (Uniform Attribution Over Redundant Data). *Let $D = \{z_i = (x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ be the training dataset for a learning algorithm \mathcal{A} based on empirical risk minimization (ERM):*

$$R(\mathcal{A}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n L(\mathcal{A}(x_i), y_i), \quad \hat{\mathcal{A}} = \arg \min_{\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{H}} R(\mathcal{A}),$$

where $L(\cdot)$ is a loss function, \mathcal{H} is a hypothesis space, and $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ is the learned predictor. Let $\phi_i(v, D)$ be the data Shapley of $z_i \in D$ defined in Eq.(1). If we replicate D to form $D' = \{z'_i\}_{i=1}^n$ with $z_i = z'_i, i \in [n]$ and train the ML model on $D \cup D'$, then

$$\phi_i(v, D \cup D') = \phi'_i(v, D \cup D'),$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \phi_i(v, D \cup D') = \sum_{i=1}^n \phi'_i(v, D \cup D') = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \phi_i(v, D).$$

where $\phi_i(v, D \cup D')$ and $\phi'_i(v, D \cup D')$ are the data Shapley of z_i and z'_i with respect to $D \cup D'$.

Consider the data market in Example 1.3 to understand how Lemma 3.1 reveals the limitations of data Shapley in certain contexts. Lemma 3.1 demonstrates the data packager can split value evenly with copyright holders simply by duplicating the original dataset D , without performing any meaningful data augmentations. This is counterintuitive and unfair, as duplicating data adds no new information and the data packager gains value by exploiting the copyrights of data creators. A fair allocation should account for the inherent dependency structures between original and augmented data, compensating the creators for the intrinsic value of their original data and the packager for the incremental performance gain achieved through meaningful data augmentations. This highlights the need for a structure-aware data valuation framework that considers the inherent structures within datasets and the broader context of their applications. The following section introduces *asymmetric data Shapley* to resolve this issue.

4 Asymmetric Data Shapley

Although data Shapley is widely used for data valuation, its symmetry axiom may yield counterintuitive outcomes in specific contexts (see Section 3). Relaxing this axiom leads to the *asymmetric Shapley value* or *weighted Shapley value* in cooperative game theory (Kalai and Samet, 1987; Nowak and Radzik, 1995; Chun, 1991). Kalai and Samet (1987) first introduced the notion of “weight system” to describe the weights and relations between players in a game and defined the asymmetric Shapley value using a random order approach. In this section, we revisit the formal definitions of weight system and asymmetric Shapley value in Nowak and Radzik (1995) using terminology from the ML community. These definitions form the basis of our proposed data valuation framework.

Definition 4.1 (Ordered Partition). Let $D = \{z_i\}_{i=1}^n$ be the training dataset, and $\sigma = \{S_1, \dots, S_m\}$ a partition of D such that $\cap_{i=1}^m S_i = \emptyset$ and $\cup_{i=1}^m S_i = D$. We define the following ordered relations:

- $z_i \stackrel{\sigma}{=} z_j$ if $z_i, z_j \in S_k$ for some $S_k \in \sigma$.
- $z_i \stackrel{\sigma}{<} z_j$ if $z_i \in S_k$ and $z_j \in S_l$, where $1 \leq k < l \leq m$. Conversely, $z_i \stackrel{\sigma}{>} z_j$.
- $z_i \stackrel{\sigma}{\leq} z_j$ if $z_i \stackrel{\sigma}{=} z_j$ or $z_i \stackrel{\sigma}{<} z_j$. Conversely, $z_i \stackrel{\sigma}{\geq} z_j$.

We call σ an ordered partition of D based on these relations. Furthermore, for any $T \subseteq D$ and $z_i \in T$, let $Max^\sigma(T) := \{z_i \in T : z_i \stackrel{\sigma}{\geq} z_j \text{ for all } z_j \in T\}$ denote the set of maximal data points in T with respect to $\stackrel{\sigma}{\geq}$.

Definition 4.2 (Ordered Permutations). Given a training set $D = \{z_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and an ordered partition σ , an ordered permutation $\pi = (z_{o_1}, z_{o_2}, \dots, z_{o_n})$ satisfies $z_{o_j} \stackrel{\sigma}{\leq} z_{o_k}$ for all $1 \leq j \leq k \leq n$. The set of all ordered permutations on D is denoted by $R^\sigma(D) = \{\pi : z_{o_j} \stackrel{\sigma}{\leq} z_{o_k} \text{ for all } 1 \leq j \leq k \leq n\}$.

Definition 4.3 (Weight System). A weight system (WS) ω of D is a pair (Λ, σ) , where $\Lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a positive weight vector, and $\sigma = \{S_1, \dots, S_m\}$ is an ordered partition of D .

In cooperative game theory, the weight vector is the contribution of each player in unanimity games. The ordered sets S_1, \dots, S_m are referred to as the ‘‘social classes’’ of players. An ordered permutation ensures that any player in a lower social class precedes those in higher social classes (Kalai and Samet, 1987). Theorem 4.1 demonstrates that asymmetric data Shapley differs from traditional data Shapley by considering marginal contributions only within ordered permutations rather than across all permutations. The weight vector determines the relative importance of each ordered permutation. To formally characterize the asymmetric data Shapley, the symmetry axiom is replaced by Axiom 4.1 (Nowak and Radzik, 1995).

Axiom 4.1 (ω -Mutual Dependence). Given $\omega = (\Lambda, \sigma)$, data points $z_i, z_j \in D$ are mutually dependent if $v(S \cup \{z_i\}) = v(S) = v(S \cup \{z_j\})$ for all $S \subseteq D \setminus \{z_i, z_j\}$. In this case, we assume:

$$\frac{\phi_i(v, D)}{\lambda_i} = \begin{cases} \frac{\phi_j(v, D)}{\lambda_j}, & \text{if } z_i \stackrel{\sigma}{=} z_j, \\ 0, & \text{if } z_i \stackrel{\sigma}{<} z_j. \end{cases}$$

Then, the formulation of asymmetric data Shapley under general WS is provided as follows.

Theorem 4.1 (Asymmetric Data Shapley Under General WS). Given a weight system $\omega = (\Lambda, \sigma)$, any data value $\phi_i^\omega(v, D), i \in [n]$ that satisfies Axiom 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 and 4.1 has the unique formulation:

$$\phi_i^\omega(v, D) = \sum_{\pi \in \Pi(D)} p_\pi [v(\pi^i \cup \{z_i\}) - v(\pi^i)], \quad (3)$$

where $\pi \in \Pi(D)$ is any possible permutation of data points in D and π^i is the set of all predecessors of z_i in the permutation $\pi = (z_{o_1}, z_{o_2}, \dots, z_{o_n})$, and

$$p_\pi = \begin{cases} \prod_{k=1}^n \frac{\lambda_{o_k}}{\sum_{z_{o_l} \in \text{Max}^\sigma \{z_{o_1}, \dots, z_{o_k}\}} \lambda_{o_l}} & \text{if } \pi \in R^\sigma(D), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

Eq.(3) shows that the asymmetric data Shapley of z_i is the weighted average of its marginal contributions $v(\pi^i \cup \{z_i\}) - v(\pi^i)$ across all permutations, according to the distribution p_π in Eq.(4). Unlike data Shapley, which employs a uniform distribution across all permutations (see Eq.(2)), asymmetric data Shapley filters out non-ordered permutations and assigns them zero weights, allowing for greater flexibility to capture the inherent structures within the sample space by using different ordered partitions and weight systems.

Note that the above definitions and theorems were primarily introduced by Kalai and Samet (1987); Nowak and Radzik (1995) in the context of cooperative game theory. However, a general weight system is not well-suited for data valuation in supervised machine learning. Thus, we propose the *intra-class uniform weight system* (ICU-WS) tailored specifically for data valuation tasks in the ML community.

Definition 4.4 (Intra-Class Uniform Weight System). A weight system $\omega = (\Lambda, \sigma)$ is called an *intra-class uniform weight system* (ICU-WS) if all $z_i, z_j \in S_k, S_k \in \sigma$ have equal weights, i.e., $\lambda_i = \lambda_j$.

The following theorem provides an alternative formulation of asymmetric data Shapley under ICU-WS.

Theorem 4.2 (Asymmetric Data Shapley Under ICU-WS). *Given any ICU-WS ω , the asymmetric data Shapley of $z_i \in S_k, S_k \in \sigma = \{S_1, \dots, S_m\}$ is:*

$$\phi_{i,S_k}^\omega = \sum_{\pi \in \Pi(D)} p_\pi [v(\pi^i \cup \{z_i\}) - v(\pi^i)], \quad (5)$$

where the weight distribution p_π is defined as:

$$p_\pi = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^m |S_j|!}, & \text{if } \pi \text{ in } R^\sigma(D), \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

It can also be expressed in the equivalent form:

$$\phi_{i,S_k}^\omega = \frac{1}{|S_k|} \sum_{S \subseteq S_k \setminus \{z_i\}} \frac{1}{\binom{|S_k|-1}{|S|}} [v(S \cup (\cup_{j=1}^{k-1} S_j) \cup \{z_i\}) - v(S \cup (\cup_{j=1}^{k-1} S_j))]. \quad (7)$$

For $k = 1$, it is easy to show $\phi_{i,S_1}^\omega(v, D) = \phi_i(v, S_1)$, where $\phi_i(v, S_1)$ is the data Shapley of z_i with respect to the training set S_1 . This implies that, under ICU-WS, the asymmetric data Shapley is equivalent to the traditional data Shapley when only the first social class is used for training, and is unaffected by data from subsequent classes. For $k \geq 2$, the asymmetric data Shapley for any higher class data point captures its average marginal contribution, given that all data points from lower classes have already been included in the training set. This effectively captures the additional value contributed by a higher-class data point when added to the union of all data from lower classes.

Proposition 4.1 (Class-Wise Efficiency of Asymmetric Data Shapley Under ICU-WS). *Given any ICU-WS ω , the following holds for any $S_k \in \sigma$:*

$$\sum_{z_i \in S_k} \phi_{i,S_k}^\omega = v(\cup_{j=1}^k S_j) - v(\cup_{j=1}^{k-1} S_j), \quad (8)$$

where $\cup_{j=1}^{k-1} S_j = \emptyset$ when $k = 1$. Proposition 4.1 demonstrates the class-wise efficiency of the asymmetric data Shapley under ICU-WS, showing that the total value of data points in each social class equals the incremental performance gain contributed by that class. For $k = 1$, Eq.(8) simplifies to $\sum_{z_i \in S_1} \phi_{i,S_1}^\omega = v(S_1) - v(\emptyset)$, aligning with the efficiency axiom of data Shapley with respect to training set S_1 . The results in Theorem 4.2 and Proposition 4.1 address the questions raised in Examples 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3. We now present propositions detailing different weight systems for these ML tasks.

Proposition 4.2 (WS for Data Shapley). *Given any ICU-WS $\omega = (\Lambda, \sigma)$ where $\sigma = \{D\}$, then $p_\pi = \frac{1}{n!}$ for any $\pi \in \Pi(D)$ and the asymmetric data Shapley reduces to data Shapley.*

Proposition 4.3 (WS for Valuation of Augmented Data). *Let D be the original training dataset and \tilde{D} the augmented dataset generated from D . The ML model is trained on $D \cup \tilde{D}$. Define an ICU-WS $\omega = (\Lambda, \sigma)$ with $\sigma = \{S_1 = D, S_2 = \tilde{D}\}$, then $p_\pi = \frac{1}{|S_1|!|S_2|!}$ for any $\pi \in R^\sigma(D \cup \tilde{D})$ and 0 otherwise.*

In Proposition 4.3, $R^\sigma(D \cup \tilde{D})$ encompasses permutations where all the original data points precede all the augmented data points. The asymmetric data Shapley for an original data point captures its average marginal contribution, assuming no knowledge of the augmented data. An augmented data point captures its average marginal contribution, given that all original data are included in the training set. Hence, the WS of asymmetric data Shapley in Proposition 4.3 captures both the intrinsic value of each original data point and the incremental value that each augmented data point contributes to the original training dataset.

Proposition 4.4 (WS for Valuation of Sequential Data). *Let $D_t = \{z_{i,t} = (x_{i,t}, y_{i,t})\}_{i=1}^{n_t}$ be the data arriving at period t for $t \in [T]$. Given any ICU-WS $\omega = (\Lambda, \sigma)$ with $\sigma = \{S_t = D_t \mid t \in [T]\}$, then $p_\pi = \frac{1}{\prod_{t=1}^T |S_t|!}$ for any $\pi \in R^\sigma(\cup_{t=1}^T D_t)$ and 0 otherwise.*

In Proposition 4.4, $R^\sigma(\cup_{t=1}^T D_t)$ encompasses permutations where data points from earlier periods always precede those from later periods. The asymmetric data Shapley of any data point $z_{i,t} \in D_t$ captures its average marginal contribution, given that all data from periods up to $t - 1$ have already been included in the training set. Hence, the asymmetric data Shapley in Proposition 4.4 measures the incremental value each newly arrived data point in a stream contributes to the previously arrived data up to the current period.

5 Efficient Data Valuation Algorithms

5.1 Monte-Carlo Method

The asymmetric data Shapley of $z_i \in D$ is its expected marginal contribution under the distribution $\mathcal{P}_\omega = \{p_\pi : \pi \in \Pi(D)\}$. It can be approximated by averaging marginal contributions across permutations sampled from \mathcal{P}_ω . Under ICU-WS, \mathcal{P}_ω becomes a uniform distribution over $R^\sigma(D)$, enabling efficient sampling. The detailed steps are provided in Algorithm 1. When using the WS from Proposition 4.2, this algorithm simplifies to the Monte Carlo method for approximating data Shapley, as discussed in (Jia et al., 2019a; Ghorbani and Zou, 2019; Wu et al., 2023). The overall time complexity to achieve an (ϵ, δ) -approximation is $O((n^2/\epsilon^2) \log(n/\delta))$ (Wu et al., 2023).

5.2 KNN Surrogate Method

Evaluating $v(\cdot)$ at Step 10 of Algorithm 1 requires retraining the model on various data subsets multiple times, rendering it impractical for large datasets and complex models. To overcome this, recent studies have introduced KNN-surrogate-based data valuation, which avoids retraining by using KNN as a proxy for exact data Shapley computation (Jia et al., 2019a; Wang et al., 2023). Building on this approach, we propose a KNN-surrogate method for the exact computation of asymmetric data Shapley under ICU-WS. First, we define the score function of a KNN classifier.

Let $D = \{z_i = (x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ be the training dataset and $D_{\text{test}} = \{z_{\text{test},i} = (x_{\text{test},i}, y_{\text{test},i})\}_{i=1}^{n_{\text{test}}}$ be the test set, where y_i 's are categorical. Given a $x_{\text{test},i}$, the probability of classifying it as y using a KNN classifier is:

$$\mathbb{P}(x_{\text{test},i} \rightarrow y) = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{j=1}^K \mathbb{1}[y_{d_j} = y]$$

Algorithm 1 Monte Carlo Asymmetric Data Shapley

- 1: **Input:** Training dataset $D = \{z_i = (x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$, learning algorithm \mathcal{A} , performance score $v(\cdot)$, and an ICU-WS $\omega = (\Lambda, \sigma)$ with $\sigma = (S_1, \dots, S_m)$.
 - 2: Initialize $\phi_{i,S_k}^\omega \leftarrow 0$ for all $i \in [|S_k|], S_k \in \sigma; v_0^t \leftarrow v(\emptyset, \mathcal{A}); t \leftarrow 0$.
 - 3: **while** convergence criteria not met **do**
 - 4: $t \leftarrow t + 1$
 - 5: **for** $k = 1, \dots, m$ **do**
 - 6: Randomly sample a permutation $\pi_{t,k} = (z_{t,k,1}, \dots, z_{t,k,|S_k|})$ within each social class S_k .
 - 7: **end for**
 - 8: Concatenate permutations in each class to form the complete permutation $\pi_t \in R^\sigma(D)$, denoted as $\pi_t = (\pi_{t,1}, \dots, \pi_{t,m}) = (z_{t,o_1}, z_{t,o_2}, \dots, z_{t,o_n})$.
 - 9: **for** $i = 1, \dots, n$ **do**
 - 10: $v_i^t \leftarrow v(\{z_{t,o_1}, \dots, z_{t,o_i}\}, \mathcal{A})$,
 - 11: $\phi_{i,S_k}^\omega \leftarrow \frac{t-1}{t} \phi_{i,S_k}^\omega + \frac{1}{t} (v_i^t - v_{i-1}^t)$.
 - 12: **end for**
 - 13: **end while**
 - 14: **Output:** The asymmetric data Shapley values of all training data points $\{\phi_{i,S_k}^\omega, i \in [|S_k|], S_k \in \sigma\}$.
-

where d_j is the index of the j -th closest point to $x_{test,i}$. Thus, the score of the KNN classifier trained on a subset $S \subseteq D$ for the test point $(x_{test,i}, y_{test,i})$ can be defined as the probability of the right label:

$$v(S) = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{j=1}^{\min\{K, |S|\}} \mathbb{1}[y_{d_j(S)} = y_{test,i}] \quad (9)$$

where $d_j(S)$ represents the index of the j -th closest point to $x_{test,i}$ in S . This score function enables an efficient iterative algorithm for computing asymmetric data Shapley under ICU-WS. We summarize the iterative formulation in Theorem 5.1.

Theorem 5.1 (Iterative Formulation of KNN Asymmetric Data Shapley). *Let $U = \cup_{j=1}^{k-1} S_j$ and $V = S_k$. For $k = 1$, let $U = \emptyset$ and $V = S_1$. Given a test point $z_{test} = (x_{test}, y_{test}) \in D_{test}$, rank all points in $U \cup V$ by some distance measure $d(x_{test}, \cdot)$. Let $d_{V,i}$ be the index of the i -th closest point to x_{test} in V and $\beta_{d_{V,i}}$ be the number of points in U that precedes $z_{d_{V,i}}$ in the ranking among all points in $U \cup V$. Based on the score function in Eq.(9), the asymmetric data Shapley for two neighboring data points $z_{d_{V,i}}, z_{d_{V,i+1}} \in V$ can then be computed recursively as follows:*

1. If $K \leq \beta_{d_{V,i}}$:

$$\phi_{d_{V,i}, S_k}^\omega - \phi_{d_{V,i+1}, S_k}^\omega = 0. \quad (10)$$

2. If $K > \beta_{d_{V,i+1}} = \beta_{d_{V,i}} = \beta$:

$$\phi_{d_{V,i}, S_k}^\omega - \phi_{d_{V,i+1}, S_k}^\omega = \frac{\mathbb{1}[y_{d_{V,i}} = y_{test}] - \mathbb{1}[y_{d_{V,i+1}} = y_{test}]}{K} \cdot \frac{\min\{K - \beta, i\}}{i}. \quad (11)$$

3. If $K > \beta_{d_{V,i+1}} > \beta_{d_{V,i}}$:

$$B = \frac{1}{|V|-1} \sum_{k=K-\beta_{d_{V,i+1}}}^{|V|-2} \sum_{m=K-\beta_{d_{V,i+1}}}^{\min\{K-\beta_{d_{V,i}}-1,k\}} \frac{\binom{k}{m} \binom{|V|-2-k}{i-1-m} \mathbb{1}[y_{d_{V,i}} = y_{test}] - \mathbb{1}[y_{d_{U,K-m}} = y_{test}]}{\binom{|V|-2}{i-1} K}. \quad (12)$$

and

$$\phi_{d_{V,i},S_k}^\omega - \phi_{d_{V,i+1},S_k}^\omega = \frac{\mathbb{1}[y_{d_{V,i}} = y_{test}] - \mathbb{1}[y_{d_{V,i+1}} = y_{test}]}{K} \cdot \frac{\min\{K - \beta_{d_{V,i+1}}, i\}}{i} + B. \quad (13)$$

4. If $\beta_{d_{V,i}} < K \leq \beta_{d_{V,i+1}}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{d_{V,i},S_k}^\omega - \phi_{d_{V,i+1},S_k}^\omega &= \frac{1}{|V|-1} \sum_{k=0}^{|V|-2} \frac{1}{\binom{|V|-2}{k}} \sum_{m=0}^{\min\{K-\beta_{d_{V,i}}-1,k\}} \frac{\binom{k}{m} \binom{|V|-2-k}{i-1-m}}{\binom{|V|-2}{i-1}} \times \\ &\quad \frac{\mathbb{1}[y_{d_{V,i}} = y_{test}] - \mathbb{1}[y_{d_{U,K-m}} = y_{test}]}{K}. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

To complete the algorithm, we must also analyze the initial point of the recursion ($\phi_{d_{V,|V|},S_k}$), as detailed in the Appendix A.4. This iterative formulation enables an efficient KNN-surrogate-based algorithm for computing asymmetric data Shapley under ICU-WS. The detailed proof and the full algorithm are provided in Appendix A.4 and 2. Similar as the KNN-surrogate-based data Shapley method (Jia et al., 2019a), the time complexity for ranking is $O(n \log n)$ and each primary step limited to $O(n^2)$ operations. Therefore, the overall time complexity is $O(n^2 + n \log(n))$.

6 Applications

This section presents three applications (see Examples 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3): **(1) Valuation of augmented data**, where each augmented data point receives a score representing its incremental value added to the original training dataset. **(2) Valuation of sequential data**, where each data point arriving sequentially in a stream receives a score indicating its incremental value added to the training data from previous periods. **(3) Fair allocation in the data marketplace**, where each participant is fairly compensated based on the contribution of their data. For (1) and (2), all experiments were repeated 10 times with different random seeds, and the means and 90% confidence bands are reported.

6.1 Valuation of Augmented Data

We apply the WS from Proposition 4.3 to quantify the incremental value contributed by each augmented data point to the original training dataset. A high value indicates high-quality augmentation, while a low or negative value suggests that the augmentation is noisy, redundant, or detrimental to the ML model.

Experimental Setup. We applied data augmentations to Adult (Becker and Kohavi, 1996), MNIST (LeCun et al., 1998), and Omniglot (Lake et al., 2015) datasets using different methods.

For the imbalanced Adult dataset, we employed Borderline-SMOTE (Han et al., 2005) to generate augmented data points in the minority class. For MNIST, we applied geometric transformations including rotations, scaling, and shifting to generate augmented images. For Omniglot, we synthesized augmented images using a generative adversarial network (GAN) (Antoniou et al., 2017). We trained 5-NN classifiers on the Adult and MNIST datasets respectively and computed the Monte Carlo Asymmetric Data Shapley (MC-ADS), Monte Carlo Data Shapley (MC-DS), KNN Asymmetric Data Shapley (KNN-ADS), KNN Data Shapley (KNN-DS), and Leave-One-Out (LOO) values for each data point in the augmented training dataset. We trained a logistic regression model on the Omniglot dataset and computed the MC-ADS, MC-DS, and LOO values for each data point. The detailed experimental setups and additional results are provided in Appendix C.1.

Sanity check of values. We validate the asymmetric data Shapley via data removal and addition experiments. Fig. 2 (a) and (b) shows that removing low/high MC-ADS or KNN-ADS value augmented data points from the augmented training dataset results in the greatest performance gain/loss. Fig. 2 (c) and (d) illustrates that adding low/high MC-ADS or KNN-ADS value augmented data points to the original training dataset yields the most significant performance loss/gain. These findings demonstrate the effectiveness of asymmetric data Shapley in identifying both low- and high-quality augmented data points that contribute either marginal or substantial incremental value to the original training dataset. Notably, MC-ADS slightly outperforms KNN-ADS when applied to a 5-NN classifier on the MNIST and Adult datasets, with both methods significantly outperforming their respective baselines (MC-DS and KNN-DS) in identifying both high- and low-quality augmented data points.




Figure 2: The y-axis represents the relative accuracy, calculated as the test accuracy divided by the model’s initial test accuracy without any data removal or addition. (a) and (b) illustrate the change in relative accuracy when low-/high-value augmented data points are removed from the augmented training set. (c) and (d) illustrate the change in relative accuracy when low-/high-value augmented data are added to the original training dataset.




Figure 3: The distribution of augmentation parameters for augmented images with high and low MC-ADS values for digits 0 and 1 in the MNIST dataset.

Refine Data Augmentation Strategies. Analyzing the distribution of augmentation parameters for data points with high and low asymmetric data Shapley values reveals important characteristics of effective augmentations. Fig. 3 shows these distributions for the top and bottom 20% of augmented data points, based on MC-ADS values, for digits 0 and 1 across 10 sampled MNIST training sets. For digit 0, high-value augmentations are typically associated with negative rotation angles (counterclockwise), while low-value points tend to have positive angles (clockwise). For digit 1, effective augmentations generally involve positive rotation angles and scaling factors less than 1. Additionally, high-value augmented points often exhibit horizontal shifts of about 0.05 units in either direction.

6.2 Valuation of Sequential Data

We apply the WS from Proposition 4.4 to quantify the incremental value that each newly arrived data point in a data stream adds to the existing training dataset selected from previous periods. A high value indicates the newly arrived data point provides substantial new information, while a low value suggests it offers only marginal improvement to the existing model.

Experimental Setup. We use the Metro Interstate Traffic Volume dataset (Hogue, 2019), focusing on data from July to September 2013, which contains 748 observations in July, 650 in August, and 478 in September. Each month’s data is randomly split into 70% for training and 30% for testing. The objective is to train and update a decision tree classifier to predict whether the hourly traffic volume exceeds 3,500 as new data becomes available each month. Utilizing the training data from July as initial training dataset, we sequentially add either high- or low-value data points from August and track changes in model performance, measured by accuracy on the July-August test set (see Fig. 4 (a) and (b)). Fig. 4 (b) shows that performance peaks after adding the top 10% high-value August data to the initial training set. Therefore, we updated the training set using these




Figure 4: The results of data addition experiment on the Traffic dataset. (a) and (b) illustrate the change in relative accuracy on the test set when high-value data points from August are added to the initial training set consisting of data points from July. Adding high MC-ADS value data points results in the most significant performance gain, and the performance peaks after the top 10% high-value August data are added to the July training set. (c) and (d) illustrate the change in relative accuracy on the test set when high-value data points from September are added to the updated training set consisting of July data and the selected top 10% high-value August data.




Figure 5: The allocation to the data creators and the data packager based on KNN-Shapley and KNN-asymmetric-Shapley under the data replication scenario.

high-quality points from August and then repeated the above process with September data (see Fig. 4 (c) and (d)). Detailed experimental setups and additional results are in Appendix C.2.

Sanity check of values. Fig. 4 (a) and (b) show that adding the least/most valuable August points identified by MC-ADS leads to the greatest performance loss/gain. (c) and (d) demonstrate the same pattern for September data. These highlight the effectiveness of asymmetric data Shapley in identifying both high- and low-quality points in sequential data valuation.

6.3 Fair Allocation in Data Market

We demonstrate the utility of asymmetric data Shapley for fair allocation in a data market involving data creators, a data packager, and a buyer (see Fig. 1). We explore the following two scenarios. The first scenario involves a data packager simply replicating the original training dataset without adding value through meaningful data augmentation. The second one presents a more realistic case where the packager performs meaningful data augmentation, as detailed in Appendix C.3. For the first scenario, our results show that data Shapley allows the packager to gain value by merely replicating the data, undermining the creators’ copyright and discouraging meaningful augmentation. The more replications, the more value the packager accrues (See Fig. 5). In contrast, asymmetric data Shapley protects the creators’ copyrights by consistently allocating the intrinsic value of the original data to them, while only allocating the incremental value added through meaningful data augmentation to the packager owing to the class-wise efficiency (see Proposition 4.1). The detailed setups and additional analysis are in Appendix C.3.

7 Conclusion and Future Work

This paper introduces asymmetric data Shapley, which extends data Shapley with weight systems to capture inherent structures within the datasets for structure-aware data valuation. We also propose algorithms for its approximation and efficient computation. Experiments show that our approach outperforms state-of-the-art methods in the valuation of augmented and sequential data, as well as allocation in data markets.

There are several promising directions for future research in this domain. One potential avenue is to further explore the asymmetric data Shapley framework in more complex scenarios. Currently, our proposed algorithms are limited to intra-class uniform weight systems, so extending them to efficiently compute the asymmetric Shapley value for general weight systems remains an open challenge. Additionally, inspired by works such as Ghorbani et al. (2020); Wu et al. (2024), examining the statistical properties of asymmetric data Shapley in relation to underlying data distributions could offer valuable insights.

References

- Anish Agarwal, Munther Dahleh, and Tuhin Sarkar. A marketplace for data: An algorithmic solution. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 701–726, 2019.
- Sam Altman. Planning for agi and beyond. *OpenAI Blog*, February, 2023.
- Antreas Antoniou, Amos Storkey, and Harrison Edwards. Data augmentation generative adversarial networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.04340*, 2017.

- Barry Becker and Ronny Kohavi. Adult. UCI Machine Learning Repository, 1996. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24432/C5XW20>.
- Youngsub Chun. On the symmetric and weighted shapley values. *International Journal of Game Theory*, 20:183–190, 1991.
- Pradeep Dubey and Robert J Weber. Probabilistic values for games. 1977.
- Christopher Frye, Colin Rowat, and Ilya Feige. Asymmetric shapley values: incorporating causal knowledge into model-agnostic explainability. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1229–1239, 2020.
- Amirata Ghorbani and James Zou. Data shapley: Equitable valuation of data for machine learning. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 2242–2251. PMLR, 2019.
- Amirata Ghorbani, Michael Kim, and James Zou. A distributional framework for data valuation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 3535–3544. PMLR, 2020.
- Hui Han, Wen-Yuan Wang, and Bing-Huan Mao. Borderline-smote: a new over-sampling method in imbalanced data sets learning. In *International conference on intelligent computing*, pages 878–887. Springer, 2005.
- John Hogue. Metro Interstate Traffic Volume. UCI Machine Learning Repository, 2019. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24432/C5X60B>.
- Ruoxi Jia, David Dao, Boxin Wang, Frances Ann Hubis, Nezihe Merve Gurel, Bo Li, Ce Zhang, Costas J Spanos, and Dawn Song. Efficient task-specific data valuation for nearest neighbor algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.08619*, 2019a.
- Ruoxi Jia, David Dao, Boxin Wang, Frances Ann Hubis, Nick Hynes, Nezihe Merve Gürel, Bo Li, Ce Zhang, Dawn Song, and Costas J Spanos. Towards efficient data valuation based on the shapley value. In *The 22nd International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1167–1176. PMLR, 2019b.
- Ehud Kalai and Dov Samet. On weighted shapley values. *International journal of game theory*, 16(3):205–222, 1987.
- Yongchan Kwon and James Zou. Beta shapley: a unified and noise-reduced data valuation framework for machine learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14049*, 2021.
- Yongchan Kwon and James Y Zou. Weightedshap: analyzing and improving shapley based feature attributions. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:34363–34376, 2022.
- Brenden M Lake, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Joshua B Tenenbaum. Human-level concept learning through probabilistic program induction. *Science*, 350(6266):1332–1338, 2015.
- Yann LeCun, Léon Bottou, Yoshua Bengio, and Patrick Haffner. Gradient-based learning applied to document recognition. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 86(11):2278–2324, 1998.

- Zhihong Liu, Hoang Anh Just, Xiangyu Chang, Xi Chen, and Ruoxi Jia. 2D-shapley: A framework for fragmented data valuation. In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 202 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 21730–21755. PMLR, 23–29 Jul 2023.
- Dov Monderer and Dov Samet. Variations on the shapley value. *Handbook of game theory with economic applications*, 3:2055–2076, 2002.
- A NEYMAN and WEBER R.J. Value theory without efficiency. 1981.
- Andrzej S Nowak and T Radzik. On axiomatizations of the weighted shapley values. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 8(2):389–405, 1995.
- Konstantin D Pandl, Fabian Feiland, Scott Thiebes, and Ali Sunyaev. Trustworthy machine learning for health care: scalable data valuation with the shapley value. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Health, Inference, and Learning*, pages 47–57, 2021.
- Mustapha Ridaoui, Michel Grabisch, and Christophe Labreuche. An axiomatisation of the banzhaf value and interaction index for multichoice games. In *Modeling Decisions for Artificial Intelligence: 15th International Conference, MDAI 2018, Mallorca, Spain, October 15–18, 2018, Proceedings 15*, pages 143–155. Springer, 2018.
- Bukhoree Sahoh and Anant Chokhuri. The role of explainable artificial intelligence in high-stakes decision-making systems: a systematic review. *Journal of Ambient Intelligence and Humanized Computing*, 14(6):7827–7843, 2023.
- Stephanie Schoch, Haifeng Xu, and Yangfeng Ji. Cs-shapley: Class-wise shapley values for data valuation in classification. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:34574–34585, 2022.
- Lloyd S Shapley et al. A value for n-person games. 1953.
- Connor Shorten and Taghi M Khoshgoftaar. A survey on image data augmentation for deep learning. *Journal of big data*, 6(1):1–48, 2019.
- Siyi Tang, Amirata Ghorbani, Rikiya Yamashita, Sameer Rehman, Jared A Dunnmon, James Zou, and Daniel L Rubin. Data valuation for medical imaging using shapley value and application to a large-scale chest x-ray dataset. *Scientific reports*, 11(1):8366, 2021.
- Jiachen T Wang, Yuqing Zhu, Yu-Xiang Wang, Ruoxi Jia, and Prateek Mittal. Threshold knn-shapley: A linear-time and privacy-friendly approach to data valuation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.15709*, 2023.
- Mengmeng Wu, Ruoxi Jia, Changle Lin, Wei Huang, and Xiangyu Chang. Variance reduced Shapley value estimation for trustworthy data valuation. *Computers & Operations Research*, 159:106305, 2023.
- Mengmeng Wu, Zhihong Liu, Xiang Li, Ruoxi Jia, and Xiangyu Chang. Uncertainty quantification of data shapley via statistical inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.19373*, 2024.
- Keiichi Yasumoto, Hirozumi Yamaguchi, and Hiroshi Shigeno. Survey of real-time processing technologies of iot data streams. *Journal of Information Processing*, 24(2):195–202, 2016.

Supplementary Material to Towards Data Valuation via Asymmetric Data Shapley

A Missing Proofs

A.1 Proof of Lemma 3.1

Proof. For any subset $S \subseteq (D \cup D') \setminus \{z_i, z'_i\}$ where $z_i = z'_i$, we have $S \cup \{z_i\} = S \cup \{z'_i\}$. Hence, the training sets $S \cup \{z_i\}$ and $S \cup \{z'_i\}$ yield identical ML models, leading to $v(S \cup \{z_i\}) = v(S \cup \{z'_i\})$. By the symmetry axiom,

$$\phi_i(v, D \cup D') = \phi'_i(v, D \cup D').$$

Using the efficiency axiom, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n \phi_i(v, D \cup D') &= \sum_{i=1}^n \phi'_i(v, D \cup D') = \frac{1}{2} (v(D \cup D') - v(\emptyset)) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} (v(D) - v(\emptyset)) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \phi_i(v, D). \end{aligned}$$

Here, $v(D \cup D') = v(D)$ because replicating the entire training dataset does not affect the learned predictor or the performance score, as the minimizers of the ERM problem (see Eq. (3.1) in the main article) are invariant to constant scaling. \square

A.2 Proof of Theorem 4.2

Proof. Given an ICU-WS $\omega = (\Lambda, \sigma)$ where $\sigma = (S_1, \dots, S_m)$ is an ordered partition of D . Recall that based on the ordered partition, an ordered permutation $\pi = (z_{o_1}, z_{o_2}, \dots, z_{o_n})$ satisfies $z_{o_j} \stackrel{\sigma}{\leq} z_{o_k}$ for all $1 \leq j \leq k \leq n$. The set of all ordered permutations is denoted by $R^\sigma(D) = \left\{ \pi : z_{o_j} \stackrel{\sigma}{\leq} z_{o_k} \text{ for all } 1 \leq j \leq k \leq n \right\}$. By the definition of asymmetric data Shapley (see Theorem 4.1 in the main article), for any datum $z_i \in S_k, S_k \in \sigma$, it is easy to show that the probability distribution over all permutations $P_\omega = \{p_\pi : \pi \in \Pi(D)\}$ has the form:

$$p_\pi = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^m |S_j|!}, & \text{if } \pi \text{ in } R^\sigma(D), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $|S_j|$ is the cardinality of S_j . We then derive an alternative formulation of the asymmetric data Shapley under ICU-WS for any $z_i \in S_k, S_k \in \sigma$. For any datum $z_i \in S_k$ and any ordered permutation $\pi \in R^\sigma(D)$, $\bigcup_{j=1}^{k-1} S_j \subseteq \pi^i \subseteq \bigcup_{j=1}^k S_j$, where π^i is the set of all predecessors of datum z_i in the permutation π . Let $S = \pi^i \setminus \left(\bigcup_{j=1}^{k-1} S_j \right) \subseteq S_k \setminus \{z_i\}$. The key observation is that, for some fixed set of predecessors π^i of datum z_i , there exist $\left(\prod_{j=1}^{k-1} |S_j|! \right) |S|! (|S_k| - |S| - 1)! \left(\prod_{j=k+1}^m |S_j|! \right)$ permutations that have non-zero weights $\frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^m |S_j|!}$. Therefore, the asymmetric data Shapley of $z_i \in S_k, 2 \leq k \leq m$ can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi_{i,S_k}^\omega &= \sum_{\pi \in \Pi(D)} p_\pi [v(\pi^i \cup \{z_i\}) - v(\pi^i)] \\
&= \frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^m |S_j|!} \sum_{\pi \in R^\sigma(D)} [v(\pi^i \cup \{z_i\}) - v(\pi^i)] \\
&= \frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^m |S_j|!} \sum_{\pi^i} \left(\prod_{j=1}^{k-1} |S_j|! \right) |S|! (|S_k| - |S| - 1)! \left(\prod_{j=k+1}^m |S_j|! \right) [v(\pi^i \cup \{z_i\}) - v(\pi^i)] \\
&= \frac{1}{|S_k|!} \sum_{\pi^i} |S|! (|S_k| - |S| - 1)! [v(\pi^i \cup \{z_i\}) - v(\pi^i)] \\
&= \frac{1}{|S_k|!} \sum_{S \subseteq S_k \setminus \{z_i\}} |S|! (|S_k| - |S| - 1)! [v(S \cup (\cup_{j=1}^{k-1} S_j) \cup \{z_i\}) - v(S \cup (\cup_{j=1}^{k-1} S_j))] \\
&= \frac{1}{|S_k|} \sum_{S \subseteq S_k \setminus \{z_i\}} \frac{1}{\binom{|S_k|-1}{|S|}} [v(S \cup (\cup_{j=1}^{k-1} S_j) \cup \{z_i\}) - v(S \cup (\cup_{j=1}^{k-1} S_j))].
\end{aligned}$$

For the special case where $k = 1$, $\cup_{j=1}^{k-1} S_j = \emptyset$ and $\phi_{i,S_1}^\omega = \frac{1}{|S_1|} \sum_{S \subseteq S_1 \setminus \{z_i\}} \frac{1}{\binom{|S_1|-1}{|S|}} [v(S \cup \{z_i\}) - v(S)]$,

which is equivalent to the data Shapley when solely the data in the first social class are used as training set. \square

A.3 Proof of Proposition 4.1

Given an ICU-WS $\omega = (\Lambda, \sigma)$ where $\sigma = (S_1, \dots, S_m)$, for any ordered permutation $\pi \in R^\sigma(D)$ and $k \in [m]$, by the definition of marginal contribution it is easy to see that

$$\sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{z_i \in S_j} [v(\pi^i \cup \{z_i\}) - v(\pi^i)] = v(\cup_{j=1}^k S_j) - v(\emptyset),$$

where π^i represents all the predecessors of datum z_i in the permutation π , and $v(\pi^i \cup \{z_i\}) - v(\pi^i)$ is the marginal contribution of datum $z_i \in S_j$ in the permutation π . In other words, for a given ordered permutation $\pi \in R^\sigma(D)$ and any $k \in [m]$, the sum of the marginal contributions of the data in the first k social classes is equal to the performance gain achieved by the model trained on all the data from these classes, compared to a model with random initialization. To complete the calculation, we sum over all ordered permutations $\pi \in R^\sigma(D)$ and divide both sides by $\prod_{j=1}^m |S_j|!$. The left-hand side gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^m |S_j|!} \sum_{\pi \in R^\sigma(D)} \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{z_i \in S_j} [v(\pi^i \cup \{z_i\}) - v(\pi^i)] &= \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{z_i \in S_j} \frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^m |S_j|!} \sum_{\pi \in R^\sigma(D)} [v(\pi^i \cup \{z_i\}) - v(\pi^i)] \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{z_i \in S_j} \phi_{i,S_j}^\omega.
\end{aligned}$$

The right-hand side gives

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^m |S_j|!} \times \sum_{\pi \in R^\sigma(D)} (v(\cup_{j=1}^k S_j) - v(\emptyset)) &= \frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^m |S_j|!} \times \prod_{j=1}^m |S_j|! \times (v(\cup_{j=1}^k S_j) - v(\emptyset)) \\ &= v(\cup_{j=1}^k S_j) - v(\emptyset). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{z_i \in S_j} \phi_{i,S_j}^\omega = v(\cup_{j=1}^k S_j) - v(\emptyset)$. For any $k \in [m]$, we have

$$\sum_{z_i \in S_k} \phi_{i,S_k}^\omega = v\left(\cup_{j=1}^k S_j\right) - v\left(\cup_{j=1}^{k-1} S_j\right),$$

where $\cup_{j=1}^{k-1} S_j = \emptyset$ when $k = 1$.

A.4 Proof of Theorem 5.1

To prove Theorem 5.1, we need to first prove the following lemma.

Lemma A.1. For any datum $z_i, z_j \in S_k$, $S_k \in \sigma$, the difference in asymmetric data Shapley between them is:

$$\phi_{i,S_k}^\omega - \phi_{j,S_k}^\omega = \frac{1}{|S_k| - 1} \sum_{S \subseteq S_k \setminus \{z_i, z_j\}} \frac{v(S \cup (\cup_{q=1}^{k-1} S_q) \cup \{z_i\}) - v(S \cup (\cup_{q=1}^{k-1} S_q) \cup \{z_j\})}{\binom{|S_k|-2}{|S|}}$$

where $|S_k|$ is the cardinality (i.e., number of data points) in S_k .

Proof. For any $z_i, z_j \in S_k$, $S_k \in \sigma$,

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{i,S_k}^\omega - \phi_{j,S_k}^\omega &= \frac{1}{|S_k|} \sum_{S \subseteq S_k \setminus \{z_i\}} \frac{1}{\binom{|S_k|-1}{|S|}} \left[v(S \cup (\cup_{q=1}^{k-1} S_q) \cup \{z_i\}) - v(S \cup (\cup_{q=1}^{k-1} S_q)) \right] \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{|S_k|} \sum_{S \subseteq S_k \setminus \{z_j\}} \frac{1}{\binom{|S_k|-1}{|S|}} \left[v(S \cup (\cup_{q=1}^{k-1} S_q) \cup \{z_j\}) - v(S \cup (\cup_{q=1}^{k-1} S_q)) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{|S_k|} \sum_{S \subseteq S_k \setminus \{z_i, z_j\}} \frac{1}{\binom{|S_k|-1}{|S|}} \left[v\left(S \cup \left(\cup_{q=1}^{k-1} S_q\right) \cup \{z_i\}\right) - v\left(S \cup \left(\cup_{q=1}^{k-1} S_q\right) \cup \{z_j\}\right) \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{|S_k|} \sum_{S \in \{T \mid T \subseteq S_k, z_i \notin T, z_j \in T\}} \frac{1}{\binom{|S_k|-1}{|S|}} \left[v\left(S \cup \left(\cup_{q=1}^{k-1} S_q\right) \cup \{z_i\}\right) - v\left(S \cup \left(\cup_{q=1}^{k-1} S_q\right)\right) \right] \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{|S_k|} \sum_{S \in \{T \mid T \subseteq S_k, z_i \in T, z_j \notin T\}} \frac{1}{\binom{|S_k|-1}{|S|}} \left[v\left(S \cup \left(\cup_{q=1}^{k-1} S_q\right) \cup \{z_j\}\right) - v\left(S \cup \left(\cup_{q=1}^{k-1} S_q\right)\right) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{|S_k|} \sum_{S \subseteq S_k \setminus \{z_i, z_j\}} \frac{1}{\binom{|S_k|-1}{|S|}} \left[v\left(S \cup \left(\cup_{q=1}^{k-1} S_q\right) \cup \{z_i\}\right) - v\left(S \cup \left(\cup_{q=1}^{k-1} S_q\right) \cup \{z_j\}\right) \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{|S_k|} \sum_{S \subseteq S_k \setminus \{z_i, z_j\}} \frac{1}{\binom{|S_k|-1}{|S|+1}} \left[v\left(S \cup \left(\cup_{q=1}^{k-1} S_q\right) \cup \{z_i\}\right) - v\left(S \cup \left(\cup_{q=1}^{k-1} S_q\right) \cup \{z_j\}\right) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{|S_k|} \sum_{S \subseteq S_k \setminus \{z_i, z_j\}} \left\{ \frac{1}{\binom{|S_k|-1}{|S|}} + \frac{1}{\binom{|S_k|-1}{|S|+1}} \right\} \left[v\left(S \cup \left(\cup_{q=1}^{k-1} S_q\right) \cup \{z_i\}\right) - v\left(S \cup \left(\cup_{q=1}^{k-1} S_q\right) \cup \{z_j\}\right) \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$= \frac{1}{|S_k| - 1} \sum_{S \subseteq S_k \setminus \{z_i, z_j\}} \frac{v\left(S \cup \left(\bigcup_{q=1}^{k-1} S_q\right) \cup \{z_i\}\right) - v\left(S \cup \left(\bigcup_{q=1}^{k-1} S_q\right) \cup \{z_j\}\right)}{\binom{|S_k| - 2}{|S|}}.$$

□

With Lemma A.1 in hand, we can now prove Theorem 5.1.

Proof. Let $D = \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ be the training dataset and $D_{test} = \{(x_{test,i}, y_{test,i})\}_{i=1}^{n_{test}}$ a separate testing data set. Given an ICU-WS $\omega = (\Lambda, \sigma)$ where $\sigma = (S_1, \dots, S_m)$ is an ordered partition of D . For any $S_k \in \sigma$ where $2 \leq k \leq m$, let $U = \bigcup_{j=1}^{k-1} S_j$ and $V = S_k$. For the special case $k = 1$, let $U = \emptyset$ and $V = S_1$. Let $|U|$ and $|V|$ be the cardinality of U and V (i.e., the number of data points in U and V).

Given a test data point $(x_{test}, y_{test}) \in D_{test}$, rank all data points in $(U \cup V)$ by some distance measure $d(x_{test}, \cdot)$ from the closest to the farthest. Let $d_{U,1}, \dots, d_{U,|U|}$ be the indices of all ranked data points in U where $d_{U,1}$ is the index of the data point that is the closest to x_{test} and $d_{U,|U|}$ is the index of the one that is the farthest to x_{test} in U . Similarly, let $d_{V,1}, \dots, d_{V,|V|}$ be the indices of all ranked data points in V where $d_{V,1}$ is the index of the data point that is the closest to x_{test} and $d_{V,|V|}$ is the index of the one that is the farthest to x_{test} in V . For two neighboring data points $z_{d_{V,i}}, z_{d_{V,i+1}} \in V$, let $S \subseteq V \setminus \{z_{d_{V,i}}, z_{d_{V,i+1}}\}$, where $S = S_1 \cup S_2$, $S_1 \subseteq \{z_{d_{V,1}}, \dots, z_{d_{V,i-1}}\}$, $S_2 \subseteq \{z_{d_{V,i+2}}, \dots, z_{d_{V,|V|}}\}$. For any datum $z_{d_{V,i}} \in V$, let $\beta_{d_{V,i}}$ be the number of data points in U that precede $z_{d_{V,i}}$ in the ranking of all data points in $(U \cup V)$. It is obvious that $0 \leq \beta_{d_{V,i}} \leq \beta_{d_{V,i+1}} \leq |U|$ for any two neighboring data points $z_{d_{V,i}}, z_{d_{V,i+1}} \in V$.

Using the KNN score function defined in Eq. (9) in the main article, for any $z_{d_{V,i}} \in V$, if $\beta_{d_{V,i}} + |S_1| \geq K$, then $v(S \cup U \cup \{z_{d_{V,i}}\}) = v(S \cup U)$. If $\beta_{d_{V,i}} + |S_1| < K$, then $v(S \cup U \cup \{z_{d_{V,i}}\}) - v(S \cup U) = \frac{\mathbb{1}[y_{d_{V,i}} = y_{test}] - \mathbb{1}[y_{d_{S \cup U, K}} = y_{test}]}{K}$, where $y_{d_{S \cup U, K}}$ is the true label of the datum that is the K^{th} nearest to x_{test} among all data points in $(S \cup U)$.

Similarly, for any $z_{d_{V,i+1}} \in V$, when $\beta_{d_{V,i+1}} + |S_1| \geq K$, $v(S \cup U \cup \{z_{d_{V,i+1}}\}) = v(S \cup U)$. When $\beta_{d_{V,i+1}} + |S_1| < K$, $v(S \cup U \cup \{z_{d_{V,i+1}}\}) - v(S \cup U) = \frac{\mathbb{1}[y_{d_{V,i+1}} = y_{test}] - \mathbb{1}[y_{d_{S \cup U, K}} = y_{test}]}{K}$. Therefore, the difference in score between adding the data point $z_{d_{V,i}}$ and $z_{d_{V,i+1}}$ to the set $(S \cup U)$ can be classified into the following three cases:

- When $|S_1| \geq K - \beta_{d_{V,i}}$, $v(S \cup U \cup \{z_{d_{V,i}}\}) - v(S \cup U \cup \{z_{d_{V,i+1}}\}) = 0$;
- When $|S_1| < K - \beta_{d_{V,i+1}}$, $v(S \cup U \cup \{z_{d_{V,i}}\}) - v(S \cup U \cup \{z_{d_{V,i+1}}\}) = \frac{\mathbb{1}[y_{d_{V,i}} = y_{test}] - \mathbb{1}[y_{d_{V,i+1}} = y_{test}]}{K}$;
- When $K - \beta_{d_{V,i+1}} \leq |S_1| < K - \beta_{d_{V,i}}$, $v(S \cup U \cup \{z_{d_{V,i}}\}) - v(S \cup U \cup \{z_{d_{V,i+1}}\}) = \frac{\mathbb{1}[y_{d_{V,i}} = y_{test}] - \mathbb{1}[y_{d_{U, K - |S_1|}} = y_{test}]}{K}$, where $y_{d_{U, K - |S_1|}}$ is the true label of the datum that is the $(K - |S_1|)^{\text{th}}$ farthest to x_{test} in U .

By Lemma A.1, for any two neighboring data points $z_{d_{V,i}}, z_{d_{V,i+1}} \in V = S_k$, depending on $K, \beta_{d_{V,i}}, \beta_{d_{V,i+1}}$, their asymmetric data Shapley values have the following relationships:

- If $K - \beta_{d_{V,i}} \leq 0$, $v(S \cup U \cup \{z_{d_{V,i}}\}) - v(S \cup U \cup \{z_{d_{V,i+1}}\}) = 0$ for all $S \in V \setminus \{z_{d_{V,i}}, z_{d_{V,i+1}}\}$. Therefore, $\phi_{d_{V,i}, S_k}^\omega - \phi_{d_{V,i+1}, S_k}^\omega = 0$.
- If $K - \beta_{d_{V,i+1}} > 0$,

– If $\beta_{d_{V,i}} = \beta_{d_{V,i+1}} = \beta$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi_{d_{V,i},S_k}^\omega - \phi_{d_{V,i+1},S_k}^\omega &= \frac{1}{|V|-1} \sum_{S \subseteq V \setminus \{z_{d_{V,i}}, z_{d_{V,i+1}}\}} \frac{v(S \cup U \cup \{z_{d_{V,i}}\}) - v(S \cup U \cup \{z_{d_{V,i+1}}\})}{\binom{|V|-2}{|S|}} \\
&= \frac{1}{|V|-1} \sum_{k=0}^{|V|-2} \frac{1}{\binom{|V|-2}{k}} \sum_{\substack{S_1 \subseteq \{z_{d_{V,1}}, \dots, z_{d_{V,i-1}}\} \\ S_2 \subseteq \{z_{d_{V,i+2}}, \dots, z_{d_{V,|V|}}\} \\ |S_1| + |S_2| = k \\ 0 \leq |S_1| < K - \beta}} \frac{\mathbb{1}[y_{d_{V,i}} = y_{test}] - \mathbb{1}[y_{d_{V,i+1}} = y_{test}]}{K} \\
&= \frac{\mathbb{1}[y_{d_{V,i}} = y_{test}] - \mathbb{1}[y_{d_{V,i+1}} = y_{test}]}{K \times (|V|-1)} \sum_{k=0}^{|V|-2} \frac{1}{\binom{|V|-2}{k}} \sum_{m=0}^{\min\{K-\beta-1, k\}} \binom{i-1}{m} \binom{|V|-i-1}{k-m} \\
&= \frac{\mathbb{1}[y_{d_{V,i}} = y_{test}] - \mathbb{1}[y_{d_{V,i+1}} = y_{test}]}{K} \frac{\min\{K-\beta, i\}}{i}.
\end{aligned}$$

– Otherwise, if $\beta_{d_{V,i}} < \beta_{d_{V,i+1}}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
B &= \frac{1}{|V|-1} \sum_{k=K-\beta_{d_{V,i+1}}}^{|V|-2} \frac{1}{\binom{|V|-2}{k}} \sum_{\substack{S_1 \subseteq \{z_{d_{V,1}}, \dots, z_{d_{V,i-1}}\} \\ S_2 \subseteq \{z_{d_{V,i+2}}, \dots, z_{d_{V,|V|}}\} \\ |S_1| + |S_2| = k \\ K - \beta_{d_{V,i+1}} \leq |S_1| < K - \beta_{d_{V,i}}}} \frac{\mathbb{1}[y_{d_{V,i}} = y_{test}] - \mathbb{1}[y_{d_{U, K-|S_1|}} = y_{test}]}{K} \\
&= \frac{1}{|V|-1} \sum_{k=K-\beta_{d_{V,i+1}}}^{|V|-2} \frac{1}{\binom{|V|-2}{k}} \sum_{m=K-\beta_{d_{V,i+1}}}^{\min\{K-\beta_{d_{V,i}}-1, k\}} \binom{i-1}{m} \binom{|V|-i-1}{k-m} \frac{\mathbb{1}[y_{d_{V,i}} = y_{test}] - \mathbb{1}[y_{d_{U, K-m}} = y_{test}]}{K} \\
&= \frac{1}{|V|-1} \sum_{k=K-\beta_{d_{V,i+1}}}^{|V|-2} \sum_{m=K-\beta_{d_{V,i+1}}}^{\min\{K-\beta_{d_{V,i}}-1, k\}} \frac{\binom{k}{i-1-m} \binom{|V|-2-k}{i-1-m}}{\binom{|V|-2}{i-1}} \frac{\mathbb{1}[y_{d_{V,i}} = y_{test}] - \mathbb{1}[y_{d_{U, K-m}} = y_{test}]}{K},
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi_{d_{V,i},S_k}^\omega - \phi_{d_{V,i+1},S_k}^\omega &= \frac{1}{|V|-1} \sum_{S \subseteq V \setminus \{z_{d_{V,i}}, z_{d_{V,i+1}}\}} \frac{v(S \cup U \cup \{z_{d_{V,i}}\}) - v(S \cup U \cup \{z_{d_{V,i+1}}\})}{\binom{|V|-2}{|S|}} \\
&= \frac{1}{|V|-1} \sum_{k=0}^{|V|-2} \frac{1}{\binom{|V|-2}{k}} \sum_{\substack{S_1 \subseteq \{z_{d_{V,1}}, \dots, z_{d_{V,i-1}}\} \\ S_2 \subseteq \{z_{d_{V,i+2}}, \dots, z_{d_{V,|V|}}\} \\ |S_1| + |S_2| = k \\ 0 \leq |S_1| < K - \beta_{d_{V,i}}}} [v(S \cup \{z_{d_{V,i}}\}) - v(S \cup \{z_{d_{V,i+1}}\})] \\
&= \frac{1}{|V|-1} \sum_{k=0}^{|V|-2} \frac{1}{\binom{|V|-2}{k}} \sum_{\substack{S_1 \subseteq \{z_{d_{V,1}}, \dots, z_{d_{V,i-1}}\} \\ S_2 \subseteq \{z_{d_{V,i+2}}, \dots, z_{d_{V,|V|}}\} \\ |S_1| + |S_2| = k \\ 0 \leq |S_1| < K - \beta_{d_{V,i+1}}}} \frac{\mathbb{1}[y_{d_{V,i}} = y_{test}] - \mathbb{1}[y_{d_{V,i+1}} = y_{test}]}{K}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \frac{1}{|V|-1} \sum_{k=K-\beta_{d_{V,i+1}}}^{|V|-2} \frac{1}{\binom{|V|-2}{k}} \sum_{\substack{S_1 \subseteq \{z_{d_{V,1}}, \dots, z_{d_{V,i-1}}\} \\ S_2 \subseteq \{z_{d_{V,i+2}}, \dots, z_{d_{V,|V|}}\} \\ |S_1|+|S_2|=k \\ K-\beta_{d_{V,i+1}} \leq |S_1| < K-\beta_{d_{V,i}}} } \frac{\mathbb{1}[y_{d_{V,i}} = y_{test}] - \mathbb{1}[y_{d_{U,K-|S_1|}} = y_{test}]}{K} \\
& = \frac{\mathbb{1}[y_{d_{V,i}} = y_{test}] - \mathbb{1}[y_{d_{V,i+1}} = y_{test}]}{K} \frac{\min\{K - \beta_{d_{V,i+1}}, i\}}{i} + B.
\end{aligned}$$

- If $K - \beta_{d_{V,i+1}} \leq 0 < K - \beta_{d_{V,i}}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi_{d_{V,i}, S_k}^\omega - \phi_{d_{V,i+1}, S_k}^\omega & = \frac{1}{|V|-1} \sum_{S \subseteq V \setminus \{z_{d_{V,i}}, z_{d_{V,i+1}}\}} \frac{v(S \cup U \cup \{z_{d_{V,i}}\}) - v(S \cup U \cup \{z_{d_{V,i+1}}\})}{\binom{|V|-2}{|S|}} \\
& = \frac{1}{|V|-1} \sum_{k=0}^{|V|-2} \frac{1}{\binom{|V|-2}{k}} \sum_{\substack{S_1 \subseteq \{z_{d_{V,1}}, \dots, z_{d_{V,i-1}}\} \\ S_2 \subseteq \{z_{d_{V,i+2}}, \dots, z_{d_{V,|V|}}\} \\ |S_1|+|S_2|=k \\ 0 \leq |S_1| < K-\beta_{d_{V,i}}} } [v(S \cup U \cup \{z_{d_{V,i}}\}) - v(S \cup U \cup \{z_{d_{V,i+1}}\})] \\
& = \frac{1}{|V|-1} \sum_{k=0}^{|V|-2} \frac{1}{\binom{|V|-2}{k}} \sum_{\substack{S_1 \subseteq \{z_{d_{V,1}}, \dots, z_{d_{V,i-1}}\} \\ S_2 \subseteq \{z_{d_{V,i+2}}, \dots, z_{d_{V,|V|}}\} \\ |S_1|+|S_2|=k \\ 0 \leq |S_1| < K-\beta_{d_{V,i}}} } \frac{\mathbb{1}[y_{d_{V,i}} = y_{test}] - \mathbb{1}[y_{d_{U,K-|S_1|}} = y_{test}]}{K} \\
& = \frac{1}{|V|-1} \sum_{k=0}^{|V|-2} \frac{1}{\binom{|V|-2}{k}} \sum_{m=0}^{\min\{K-\beta_{d_{V,i}}-1, k\}} \binom{i-1}{m} \binom{|V|-i-1}{k-m} \frac{\mathbb{1}[y_{d_{V,i}} = y_{test}] - \mathbb{1}[y_{d_{U,K-m}} = y_{test}]}{K} \\
& = \frac{1}{|V|-1} \sum_{k=0}^{|V|-2} \sum_{m=0}^{\min\{K-\beta_{d_{V,i}}-1, k\}} \frac{\binom{k}{m} \binom{|V|-2-k}{i-1-m}}{\binom{|V|-2}{i-1}} \frac{\mathbb{1}[y_{d_{V,i}} = y_{test}] - \mathbb{1}[y_{d_{U,K-m}} = y_{test}]}{K}.
\end{aligned}$$

We have established the recursive relationship between the asymmetric data Shapley of two neighboring data points $z_{d_{V,i}}, z_{d_{V,i+1}}$ in V . Next, we analyze the initial point of this recursion, i.e., the asymmetric data Shapley of $z_{d_{V,|V|}} \in V$, denoted as $\phi_{d_{V,|V|}, S_k}^\omega$. Let $\beta_{d_{V,|V|}}$ represent the number of data points in U that precede datum $z_{d_{V,|V|}}$ in the ranking of all data points in $(U \cup V)$. Let $S \subseteq V \setminus \{z_{d_{V,|V|}}\}$.

- If $|S| + \beta_{d_{V,|V|}} \geq K$, $v(S \cup U \cup \{z_{d_{V,|V|}}\}) - v(S \cup U) = 0$;

- If $|S| + \beta_{d_{V,|V|}} < K$,

- If $|U| = \beta_{d_{V,|V|}}$, $v(S \cup U \cup \{z_{d_{V,|V|}}\}) - v(S \cup U) = \frac{\mathbb{1}[y_{d_{V,|V|}} = y_{test}]}{K}$.

- If $|U| > \beta_{d_{V,|V|}}$, $v(S \cup U \cup \{z_{d_{V,|V|}}\}) - v(S \cup U) = \frac{\mathbb{1}[y_{d_{V,|V|}} = y_{test}] - \mathbb{1}[y_{d_{U,K-|S|}} = y_{test}]}{K}$ where $y_{d_{U,K-|S|}}$ is the true label of the datum that is the $(K - |S|)^{th}$ farthest to x_{test} in U .

Therefore, for datum $z_{d_{V,|V|}}$ which is the farthest to x_{test} among all data points in V , depending on $K, |U|, \beta_{d_{V,|V|}}$, its asymmetric data Shapley can be computed as follows:

- If $K - \beta_{d_{V,|V|}} \leq 0$, $\phi_{d_{V,|V|}, S_k}^\omega = \frac{1}{|V|} \sum_{S \subseteq V \setminus \{z_{d_{V,|V|}}\}} \frac{1}{\binom{|V|-1}{|S|}} [v(S \cup U \cup \{z_{d_{V,|V|}}\}) - v(S \cup U)] = 0$;
- Otherwise, if $K - \beta_{d_{V,|V|}} > 0$,
 - If $|U| = \beta_{d_{V,|V|}}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \phi_{d_{V,|V|}, S_k}^\omega &= \frac{1}{|V|} \sum_{S \subseteq V \setminus \{z_{d_{V,|V|}}\}} \frac{1}{\binom{|V|-1}{|S|}} [v(S \cup U \cup \{z_{d_{V,|V|}}\}) - v(S \cup U)] \\
 &= \frac{1}{|V|} \sum_{\substack{S \subseteq V \setminus \{z_{d_{V,|V|}}\} \\ 0 \leq |S| < K - \beta_{d_{V,|V|}}} } \frac{1}{\binom{|V|-1}{|S|}} \frac{\mathbb{1}[y_{d_{V,|V|}} = y_{test}]}{K} \\
 &= \frac{\mathbb{1}[y_{d_{V,|V|}} = y_{test}]}{K} \times \frac{1}{|V|} \sum_{k=0}^{K - \beta_{d_{V,|V|}} - 1} \frac{1}{\binom{|V|-1}{k}} \sum_{\substack{|S|=k \\ S \subseteq V \setminus \{z_{d_{V,|V|}}\}}} \\
 &= \frac{\mathbb{1}[y_{d_{V,|V|}} = y_{test}]}{K} \times \frac{1}{|V|} \sum_{k=0}^{K - \beta_{d_{V,|V|}} - 1} \frac{1}{\binom{|V|-1}{k}} \times \binom{|V|-1}{k} \\
 &= \frac{\mathbb{1}[y_{d_{V,|V|}} = y_{test}]}{|V|} \times \frac{K - \beta_{d_{V,|V|}}}{K}.
 \end{aligned}$$

- If $|U| > \beta_{d_{V,|V|}}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \phi_{d_{V,|V|}, S_k}^\omega &= \frac{1}{|V|} \sum_{S \subseteq V \setminus \{z_{d_{V,|V|}}\}} \frac{1}{\binom{|V|-1}{|S|}} [v(S \cup U \cup \{z_{d_{V,|V|}}\}) - v(S \cup U)] \\
 &= \frac{1}{|V|} \sum_{\substack{S \subseteq V \setminus \{z_{d_{V,|V|}}\} \\ 0 \leq |S| < K - \beta_{d_{V,|V|}}} } \frac{1}{\binom{|V|-1}{|S|}} \frac{\mathbb{1}[y_{d_{V,|V|}} = y_{test}] - \mathbb{1}[y_{d_{U, K-|S|}} = y_{test}]}{K} \\
 &= \frac{1}{|V|} \sum_{k=0}^{K - \beta_{d_{V,|V|}} - 1} \frac{1}{\binom{|V|-1}{k}} \sum_{\substack{|S|=k \\ S \subseteq V \setminus \{z_{d_{V,|V|}}\}}} \frac{\mathbb{1}[y_{d_{V,|V|}} = y_{test}] - \mathbb{1}[y_{d_{U, K-k}} = y_{test}]}{K} \\
 &= \frac{1}{|V|} \sum_{k=0}^{K - \beta_{d_{V,|V|}} - 1} \frac{1}{\binom{|V|-1}{k}} \times \frac{\mathbb{1}[y_{d_{V,|V|}} = y_{test}] - \mathbb{1}[y_{d_{U, K-k}}^U = y_{test}]}{K} \times \binom{|V|-1}{k} \\
 &= \frac{1}{|V|} \sum_{k=0}^{K - \beta_{d_{V,|V|}} - 1} \frac{\mathbb{1}[y_{d_{V,|V|}} = y_{test}] - \mathbb{1}[y_{d_{U, K-k}} = y_{test}]}{K}
 \end{aligned}$$

$$= \frac{\mathbb{1}[y_{d_{V,|V|}} = y_{test}]}{|V|} \times \frac{K - \beta_{d_{V,|V|}}}{K} - \frac{1}{|V|} \sum_{k=0}^{K - \beta_{d_{V,|V|}} - 1} \frac{\mathbb{1}[y_{d_{U, K-k}} = y_{test}]}{K}.$$

□

B Proposed Algorithm for KNN Asymmetric Data Shapley

Our proposed algorithm for KNN asymmetric data Shapley is presented in Algorithm 2.

C Detailed Experimental Setup and Additional Results

In this section, we provide detailed experimental setups for the experiments presented in the main article, along with additional results and analysis. All computations were performed on CPUs, and the code to reproduce these results is available at <https://github.com/xzheng01/Asymmetric-Data-Shapley>.

C.1 Augmented Data Valuation

For augmented data valuation, we aim to quantify the intrinsic value of each original data point and the incremental value that each augmented data point adds to the original training dataset. Therefore, we utilize the ICU-WS defined in Proposition 4.3 for computing asymmetric data Shapley (i.e., MC-ADS and KNN-ADS). We use the data removal and addition experiments to validate the asymmetric data Shapley values. Specifically, we would expect that removing the augmented data points with the lowest/highest values from the augmented training set leads to the most significant performance improvement/degradation; adding the augmented data points with the lowest/highest values to the original training set leads to the most inefficient/efficient performance improvement. To ensure robustness, all experiments were repeated ten times using different random seeds and the means and 90% confidence bands are reported in Fig. 2 in the main article.

C.1.1 Adult

Experimental Setup. The Adult dataset (Becker and Kohavi, 1996) contains 48,842 observations, with the task of predicting whether an individual’s annual income exceeds \$50K based on census data. After removing missing values, the dataset is imbalanced: 75.09% of training observations and 75.51% of testing observations have an income below \$50K. We randomly sampled 800 instances labeled as 0 (income \leq 50k) and 200 instances labeled as 1 (income $>$ 50k) to create a training dataset of 1,000 data points, with class 0 as the majority class. The test set was constructed by randomly sampling 400 instances with label 0 and 100 instances with label 1. To address the class imbalance and improve model performance, we applied Borderline-SMOTE (Han et al., 2005) to generate additional data for the minority class (class 1), balancing the two classes and resulting in an augmented training set of 1,600 data points. We then trained a 5-NN classifier using the augmented training dataset and computed the Monte Carlo Asymmetric Data Shapley (MC-ADS), KNN Asymmetric Data Shapley (KNN-ADS), Monte Carlo Data Shapley (MC-DS)¹, KNN Data

¹The code is available at: <https://github.com/amiratag/DataShapley>

Algorithm 2 KNN Asymmetric Shapley for an unweighted KNN classifier.

Input: The training dataset $D = \{z_i = (x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$, a separate testing data set $D_{test} = \{z_{test,i} = (x_{test,i}, y_{test,i})\}_{i=1}^{n_{test}}$; K , the distance measure $d(\cdot)$, and an ICU-WS $\omega = (\Lambda, \sigma)$ where $\sigma = (S_1, \dots, S_m)$.

2: **for** $k \leftarrow 1$ to m **do**
 $U \leftarrow \cup_{j=1}^{k-1} S_j$ \triangleright denote the cardinality of U as $|U| = \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} |S_j|$
 $V \leftarrow S_k$ \triangleright denote the cardinality of V as $|V| = |S_k|$
 for $i \leftarrow 1$ to n_{test} **do**
 $(d_1, \dots, d_{|U|+|V|}) \leftarrow$ Indices of data in $(U \cup V)$ in an ascending order using $d(x_{test,i}, \cdot)$
 $(\beta_{d_{V,1}}, \dots, \beta_{d_{V,|V|}}) \leftarrow$ The number of data points in U that precedes datum $z_{d_{V,q}} \in V, q \in [|V|]$ in the ranking of all data points in $(U \cup V)$.
 8: **if** $K \leq \beta_{d_{V,|V|}}$ **then**
 $\phi_{d_{V,|V|}, S_k, i}^\omega = 0$
 10: **else if** $K > \beta_{d_{V,|V|}}$ **then**
 if $|U| = \beta_{d_{V,|V|}}$ **then**
 12: $\phi_{d_{V,|V|}, S_k, i}^\omega = \frac{\mathbb{1}[y_{d_{V,|V|}} = y_{test,i}]}{|V|} \times \frac{K - \beta_{d_{V,|V|}}}{K}$
 else if $|U| > \beta_{d_{V,|V|}}$ **then**
 14: $\phi_{d_{V,|V|}, S_k, i}^\omega = \frac{\mathbb{1}[y_{d_{V,|V|}} = y_{test,i}]}{|V|} \times \frac{K - \beta_{d_{V,|V|}}}{K} - \frac{1}{|V|} \sum_{k=0}^{K - \beta_{d_{V,|V|}} - 1} \frac{\mathbb{1}[y_{d_{U, K-k}} = y_{test,i}]}{K}$
 end if
 end if
 16: **for** $j \leftarrow |V| - 1$ to 1 **do**
 18: **if** $K \leq \beta_{d_{V,j}}$ **then**
 $\phi_{d_{V,j}, S_k, i}^\omega = \phi_{d_{V,j+1}, S_k, i}^\omega$
 20: **else if** $K > \beta_{d_{V,j+1}} = \beta_{d_{V,j}}$ **then**
 $\phi_{d_{V,j}, S_k, i}^\omega = \phi_{d_{V,j+1}, S_k, i}^\omega + \frac{\mathbb{1}[y_{d_{V,j}} = y_{test,i}] - \mathbb{1}[y_{d_{V,j+1}} = y_{test,i}]}{K} \frac{\min\{K - \beta_{d_{V,j}}\}}{j}$;
 22: **else if** $K > \beta_{d_{V,j+1}} > \beta_{d_{V,j}}$ **then**
 $\phi_{d_{V,j}, S_k, i}^\omega = \phi_{d_{V,j+1}, S_k, i}^\omega + \frac{\mathbb{1}[y_{d_{V,j}} = y_{test,i}] - \mathbb{1}[y_{d_{V,j+1}} = y_{test,i}]}{K} \frac{\min\{K - \beta_{d_{V,j+1}}, j\}}{j} + B$,
 24: where $B = \frac{1}{|V|-1} \sum_{k=K - \beta_{d_{V,j+1}}}^{|V|-2} \sum_{m=K - \beta_{d_{V,j+1}}}^{\min\{K - \beta_{d_{V,j}} - 1, k\}} \frac{\binom{k}{m} \binom{|V|-2-k}{j-1-m}}{\binom{|V|-2}{j-1}} \frac{\mathbb{1}[y_{d_{V,j}} = y_{test,i}] - \mathbb{1}[y_{d_{U, K-m}} = y_{test,i}]}{K}$.
 else if $\beta_{d_{V,j}} < K \leq \beta_{d_{V,j+1}}$ **then**
 26: $\phi_{d_{V,j}, S_k, i}^\omega = \phi_{d_{V,j+1}, S_k, i}^\omega + \frac{1}{|V|-1} \sum_{k=0}^{|V|-2} \frac{1}{\binom{|V|-2}{k}} \sum_{m=0}^{\min\{K - \beta_{d_{V,j}} - 1, k\}} \frac{\binom{k}{m} \binom{|V|-2-k}{j-1-m}}{\binom{|V|-2}{j-1}} \frac{\{\mathbb{1}[y_{d_{V,j}} = y_{test,i}] - \mathbb{1}[y_{d_{U, K-m}} = y_{test,i}]\}}{K}$
 end if
 end for
 28: $\phi_{S_k, i}^\omega \leftarrow (\phi_{d_{V,1}, S_k, i}^\omega, \phi_{d_{V,2}, S_k, i}^\omega, \dots, \phi_{d_{V,|V|}, S_k, i}^\omega)$
 30: **end for**
 $\phi_{S_k}^\omega = (\phi_{d_{V,1}, S_k}^\omega, \phi_{d_{V,2}, S_k}^\omega, \dots, \phi_{d_{V,|V|}, S_k}^\omega) \leftarrow \frac{1}{n_{test}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_{test}} \phi_{S_k, i}^\omega$
 32: **end for**

Output: $\phi^\omega = (\phi_{S_1}^\omega, \dots, \phi_{S_m}^\omega)$ — the asymmetric data Shapley for all data points in D . For $z_{d_{V,j}} \in S_k, S_k \in \sigma$, the j -th elements in $\phi_{S_k}^\omega = (\phi_{d_{V,1}, S_k}^\omega, \phi_{d_{V,2}, S_k}^\omega, \dots, \phi_{d_{V,|V|}, S_k}^\omega)$ is its asymmetric data Shapley value.

Shapley (KNN-DS)¹, and Leave-One-Out (LOO) values for each data point in the augmented training dataset. The number of neighbors in the Borderline-SMOTE method is set to 3, and the model’s performance is evaluated based on prediction accuracy on the test set. The Monte Carlo estimates converged empirically after 5,000 permutations. To ensure robust results, we repeated the entire process ten times using different random seeds and reported the means and 90% confidence bands in the first row of Fig. 2 in the main article.

C.1.2 MNIST

Experimental Setup. The MNIST dataset (LeCun et al., 1998) contains 70,000 grayscale images of handwritten digits (28x28 pixels), labeled from 0 to 9, with 60,000 images for training and 10,000 for testing. In this experiment, we randomly sampled 50 images per class from both the training and testing sets, creating an original training and testing sets of 500 images each. For data augmentation, we applied geometric transformations (Shorten and Khoshgoftaar, 2019) including random rotations (between -45 and 45 degrees), random horizontal and vertical shifts (ranging from -0.0625 to 0.0625), and random scaling (from 0.9 to 1.1), generating 500 augmented images—one for each original image. This resulted in an augmented training set of 1,000 images. We trained a 5-NN classifier on this augmented training dataset and computed the Monte Carlo Asymmetric Data Shapley (MC-ADS), KNN Asymmetric Data Shapley (KNN-ADS), Monte Carlo Data Shapley (MC-DS)², KNN Data Shapley (KNN-DS)¹, and Leave-One-Out (LOO) values for each data point. Model performance was evaluated based on prediction accuracy on the test set. The Monte Carlo estimates empirically converged after 3,000 permutations. To ensure robust results, the entire process was repeated ten times with different random seeds, and we reported the means along with the 90% confidence bands in the second row of Fig. 2 of the main article.

C.1.3 Omniglot

Experimental Setup. The Omniglot dataset (Lake et al., 2015) contains 1,623 unique characters, each with 20 grayscale images drawn by different individuals. The dataset is split into a training set of 30 alphabets and a test set of 20 alphabets. For our experiment, we randomly sampled 5 images per class from classes #1420-1439 (20 classes) to create the original training and testing sets. We then utilized the Data Augmentation Generative Adversarial Network (DAGAN) (Antoniou et al., 2017)³ to synthesize 100 augmented images, resulting in 200 images in the augmented training dataset. We trained a logistic regression model using this augmented training set and computed the MC-ADS, KNN-ADS, MC-DS², KNN-DS¹, and LOO values of each data point. In the logistic regression model, the solver is set to “liblinear”, and the maximum number of iterations is set to 5,000. Model performance was evaluated based on accuracy on the test set. The Monte Carlo estimates empirically converged after 2,000 permutations. To ensure robust results, the entire process was repeated ten times with different random seeds, and the means along with 90% confidence bands are reported in the third row of Fig. 2 of the main article.

Additional Results. We trained a 3-NN classifier using the augmented training dataset and computed the MC-ADS, KNN-ADS, MC-DS², KNN-DS¹, and LOO values of each data point. Model performance was evaluated using prediction accuracy on the test set. The Monte Carlo

¹The code is available at: <https://github.com/AI-secure/KNN-PVLDB>

²The code is available at: <https://github.com/amiratag/DataShapley>

³The code is available at: https://github.com/amurthy1/dagan_torch




Figure A.1: The results of data removal and addition experiments on the Omniglot dataset using a 3-NN classifier.

estimates converged empirically after 2,000 permutations. To ensure robust results, we repeated the above process ten times with different random seeds and reported the means and 90% confidence bands in Fig. A.1. Fig. A.1 (a) and (b) shows that removing low/high MC-ADS or KNN-ADS value augmented data points from the augmented training set results in the greatest performance gain/loss. (c) and (d) illustrates that adding low/high MC-ADS or KNN-ADS value augmented data points to the original training dataset yields the greatest performance loss/gain. These results demonstrate the effectiveness of asymmetric data Shapley in identifying both low- and high-quality augmented data points that contribute marginal or substantial incremental value to the original dataset. Notably, MC-ADS slightly outperforms KNN-ADS in this experiment, with both methods significantly outperforming their respective baselines (i.e., MC-DS and KNN-DS) in identifying both high- and low-quality augmented data points.

C.2 Sequential Data Valuation

For sequential data valuation, the goal is to quantify the incremental value that each newly arrived point in the data stream contributes to the training data from previous periods. Therefore, we utilize the ICU-WS defined in Proposition 4.4 for computing asymmetric data Shapley (i.e., MC-ADS and KNN-ADS). Specifically, for the first experiment of August data, we utilize the ICU-WS $\omega_1 = (\Lambda_1, \sigma_1)$, where $\sigma_1 = \{S_1 = \text{the set of training data from July}, S_2 = \text{the set of training data from August}\}$. Then, the asymmetric data Shapley under ω_1 captures the intrinsic value of each training data point from July and the incremental value each data point from August brings to the July training set. For the second experiment of September data, we utilize the ICU-WS $\omega_2 = (\Lambda_2, \sigma_2)$ where $\sigma_2 = \{S_1 = \text{the updated training set consisting of all July data and the selected top 10\% August data}, S_2 = \{\text{the set of training data from September}\}$. Therefore, the asymmetric data Shapley under ω_2 captures the intrinsic value of each data point in the updated training dataset and the incremental value that each data point from September adds to the updated training dataset consisting of July data and selected August data.

C.2.1 Experimental Setup.

We use the Metro Interstate Traffic Volume dataset (Hogue, 2019), which contains hourly records of westbound I-94 traffic volume in Minneapolis-St. Paul, along with corresponding weather conditions and holiday indicators from 2012 to 2018. In this experiment, we focus on data from July to September 2013, with 748 observations in July, 650 observations in August, and 478 observations in

September. Starting with the data from July, the goal is to train and sequentially update a decision tree classifier to predict whether hourly traffic volume exceeds 3,500 as new data from August and September arrives. The data in each month is randomly split into 70% for training and 30% for testing, resulting in 523 training and 225 testing observations in July, 455 training and 195 testing observations in August, and 334 training and 144 testing observations in September.

For the experiment of August data shown in Fig. 4 (a) and (b), we utilized the ICU-WS $\omega_1 = (\Lambda_1, \sigma_1)$, where $\sigma_1 = \{S_1 = \text{the set of training data from July}, S_2 = \{\text{the set of training data from August for the asymmetric data Shapley}\}$. We computed the MC-DS¹, MC-ADS and LOO values for each data point in $(S_1 \cup S_2)$, i.e., the July-August training dataset. Then, using the training data points in July (i.e., S_1) as the initial training set, we sequentially added either high- or low-value data points from August and tracked changes in model performance, which is measured by accuracy on the combined July-August test set. To ensure robustness, the entire process was repeated ten times, with means and 90% confidence bands shown in Fig. 4 (a) and (b) in the main article. Fig. 4 (b) shows that model performance peaks after incorporating the top 10% of high MC-ADS value data points from August into the initial July training set. Hence, we updated the initial training dataset by incorporating the top 10% of high MC-ADS value data points from August, resulting in a total of 568 training data points.

Next, for the experiment of September data in Fig. 4 (c) and (d), we utilized the ICU-WS $\omega_2 = (\Lambda_2, \sigma_2)$ where $\sigma_2 = \{S_1 = \text{the updated training set consisting of all July data and the selected top 10\% August data}, S_2 = \text{the set of all training data from September}\}$ for asymmetric data Shapley. We computed the MC-DS¹, MC-ADS and LOO values for each data point in $(S_1 \cup S_2)$, i.e., the union of the updated training dataset and the data from September. Starting with the updated training dataset (i.e., S_1), we sequentially added either high- or low-value data points from September and tracked model performance, which is measured by accuracy on the combined July-September test set. This process was also repeated ten times, with the means and their 90% confidence bands presented in Fig. 4 (c) and (d) in the main article.

C.2.2 Additional Results: Data Removal for Decision Tree Classifier

Fig. 4 in the main article presents the results of data addition experiments, where either high- or low-value data points from month t are sequentially added to an existing training dataset that includes data points selected up to month $t - 1$. Here, we provide results of the data removal experiments on the Traffic dataset, where either high- or low-value data points from month t are removed from the entire training dataset containing data up to month t . Note that the ICU-WS used and the data values computed are the same as those defined in Appendix C.2.1. Specifically, starting with the July-August training set of 978 observations, we sequentially removed either high- or low-value data points from August and tracked the resulting changes in model performance, measured by accuracy on the combined July-August test set. Because in the data addition experiment, the model performance peaked after adding the top 10% of high MC-ADS value data points from August, we updated the initial training dataset by incorporating these top 10% of high MC-ADS value data points from August, resulting in 568 data points in the updated training dataset. Next, starting with the union of the updated training dataset and all data points from September, we sequentially removed either high- or low-value data points from September and tracked changes in model performance, measured by accuracy on the combined July-September test set. To ensure robust results, the above

¹The code is available at: <https://github.com/amiratag/DataShapley>




Figure A.2: The results of data removal experiments in sequential data valuation scenario using a decision tree classifier on the Traffic dataset.

process was repeated ten times, and the means along with their 90% confidence bands are reported in Fig. A.2. Fig. A.2 (a) and (b) shows that removing low/high MC-ADS value data points from August leads to the most significant performance gain/loss. Similarly, (c) and (d) illustrates the same pattern for September data points. These results highlight the effectiveness of asymmetric data Shapley in identifying both high- and low-quality data points that contribute significantly or minimally in sequential data valuation scenario.

C.2.3 Additional Results: Data Addition and Removal for 5-NN Classifier

We also present the results of data addition and removal experiments for sequential data valuation on Traffic dataset when the machine learning model is an 5-NN classifier in Fig. A.3. Fig. A.3 (a) and (b) illustrates that removing low-/high- MC-ADS and KNN-ADS value August data points from the entire July-August training dataset results in the greatest performance gain/loss. Fig. A.3 (c) and (d) shows that adding low-/high- MC-ADS and KNN-ADS value August data points to the initial July training dataset results in the most significant performance loss/gain. These results highlights the effectiveness of asymmetric data Shapley in identifying both high- and low-quality data points in the sequential data valuation scenario. As shown in Fig. A.3 (d), the model performance peaked when the top 15% of high MC-ADS value data points from August are added to the initial July training dataset. Hence, we updated the initial training dataset by incorporating these top 15% of high-value data points from August, resulting in 591 data points in the updated training dataset. Then, starting with this updated training dataset consisting of initial July data and the selected high-value August data, we continued the data removal and addition experiment with September data and the results are shown in Fig. A.3 (e)-(h).




Figure A.3: The results of data addition and removal experiments in sequential data valuation scenario using a 5-NN classifier on the Traffic dataset..

C.3 Fair Allocation in the Data Market

C.3.1 Fair Allocation to multiple data creators and a data packager.

Experimental Setup. We first consider a data market involving multiple data creators, a data packager, and a buyer (see Fig. 1 in the main article). Each data creator owns the copyright to their raw data points. A third-party entity, known as the data packager, aggregates the data from these creators and refines or augments the raw dataset for specific machine learning tasks. Ultimately, the data packager sells the trained model to a buyer, generating business value. The objective is to establish a fair compensation mechanism: ensuring that data creators are fairly rewarded for their contribution of raw data, while the data packager is rewarded for the incremental value added through meaningful data augmentation, which enhances the quality of the raw dataset and the model’s performance. Based on this market setup, we explore the following two scenarios:

1. **The data replication scenario.** This scenario demonstrates an extreme case in which the data packager “steals the copyright from data creators” by merely replicating their raw dataset without adding value through meaningful data augmentation. To simulate this scenario, we used one of the sampled MNIST dataset from Section 6.1 in the main article. We trained a 5-NN classifier using three versions of the training dataset: the original training dataset (500 data points), a single replication of the original training dataset (1,000 data points), and a double replication of original training dataset (1,500 data points). For each version of the training dataset, we computed KNN-DS¹ and KNN-ADS values for each training data point. To enable asymmetric data Shapley to capture both the intrinsic value of each original data point and the incremental value of each replicated data point, we applied different ICU-WS configurations: $\omega_1 = (\Lambda_1, \sigma_1)$ where $\sigma_1 = \{S_1 = \text{the original training dataset}\}$ for the first version of the training dataset, $\omega_2 = (\Lambda_2, \sigma_2)$ where $\sigma_2 = \{S_1 = \text{the original training dataset}, S_2 =$

¹The code is available at: <https://github.com/AI-secure/KNN-PVLDB>

the first replication of original training dataset} for the second version of the training dataset, and $\omega_3 = (\Lambda_3, \sigma_3)$ where $\sigma_3 = \{S_1 = \text{the original training dataset}, S_2 = \text{the first replication of original training dataset}, S_3 = \{\text{the second replication of original training dataset}\}$ for the third version. Model performance was evaluated based on prediction accuracy on the test set. We assume that the original dataset is owned by multiple data creators, while the replicated data is generated and thus owned by the data packager. As a result, the sum of the data values for the original dataset corresponds to the monetary compensation allocated to the data creators, and the sum of the data values for all replicated data points corresponds to the compensation allocated to the data packager. The resulting data values and allocation based on KNN-DS and KNN-ADS are presented in Fig. 5 in the main article.

2. **The data augmentation scenario.** This scenario illustrates a more realistic case where the data packager adds value to the raw dataset collected from multiple creators by performing meaningful data augmentation. To simulate this, we used one of the sampled MNIST dataset with image augmentations based on geometric transformations, as detailed in Section 6.1 of the main article. A 5-NN classifier was trained on this augmented training dataset, consisting of 500 original data points and 500 augmented data points—one for each original data point. We then calculated the KNN-DS¹ and KNN-ADS values for each training data point. To let KNN-ADS capture the intrinsic value of each original data point and the incremental value each augmented data point adds to the original training dataset, we utilized the ICU-WS defined in Proposition 4.3 in the main article. Model performance was assessed by evaluating prediction accuracy on a test set. In this context, we assume that the original dataset is owned by multiple data creators, while the augmented data is generated—and therefore owned—by the data packager. Consequently, the sum of data values for the original dataset reflects the monetary compensation allocated to the data creators, while the sum of data values for all augmented data points corresponds to the compensation allocated to the data packager. The resulting data values and allocations, based on KNN-DS and KNN-ADS, are presented in Fig. A.4.

Analysis of the data replication scenario. We ranked the KNN-DS and KNN-ADS values of data points in the original training dataset from high to low and plotted all these values in Fig. 5 (a) and (e) in the main article, where the height of each bar represents the value of a data point. We then stacked the KNN-DS and KNN-ADS values of the corresponding copied data point of each original data point in the first copy in Fig. 5 (b) and (f). Similarly, in Fig. 5 (c) and (g), we continued to stack the KNN-DS and KNN-ADS values of the corresponding copied data point for each original data point in the second copy. In each of these histograms, the area of the blue region represents the total value of the original training dataset, which is proportional to the monetary value allocated to the data creators. The area of the orange and green regions correspond to the values of the first and second copies of the original training dataset, respectively. The total area of these two regions represents the monetary value that is allocated to the data packager. Fig. 5 (d) and (h) offer a summarized view of value allocation under both data Shapley and asymmetric Shapley valuations, with the blue bar showing the creators’ allocation and the orange and green bars representing the packager’s allocation.

Fig. 5 (a)-(d) in the main article illustrates that the allocation to data creators decrease significantly following data replication. As the number of replications increases, the value attributed

¹The code is available at: <https://github.com/AI-secure/KNN-PVLDB>

to data creators diminishes, while the data packager’s accrued value grows. This highlights how the data Shapley method allows the data packager to share value with data creators by simply replicating the original dataset, thereby failing to protect the copyright of the original data and to incentivize meaningful data augmentation for enhanced model training. In contrast, Fig. 5 (e)-(h) demonstrates that the asymmetric data Shapley method effectively safeguards the original copyright of data creators. Regardless of the number of replications, this approach consistently allocates all inherent value of the original dataset to the data creators, while attributing only the incremental performance gains achieved through replication to the data packager. It is noteworthy that the machine learning task in this experiment is carried out by a 5-NN classifier. Due to its non-parametric nature, even straightforward replication of the original training dataset causes slight variations in model performance on the test set. Consequently, the sum of asymmetric data Shapley values in the second and third replications is nonzero and corresponds to the incremental performance gain. This results from the class-wise efficiency of the asymmetric data Shapley method under ICU-WS, as detailed in Proposition 4.1 of the main article.

Analysis of the data augmentation scenario. We ranked the KNN-DS and KNN-ADS values of data points in the original dataset from high to low and plotted all these values in Fig. A.4 (a) and (d), where the height of each bar represents the value of a data point. We then stacked the KNN-DS and KNN-ADS values of the corresponding augmented data point for each original data point in Fig. A.4 (b) and (e). The area of the blue region represents the total value of the original dataset, which is proportional to the monetary value allocated to the data creators, whereas the area of the orange region corresponds to the total value of the augmented data, corresponding to the monetary value allocated to the data packager. Since augmented data points with zero or negative values are deemed useless or harmful to the ML model, we assume that the data packager discards these points and incorporates only the augmented data points with positive values into the original training dataset for training the final ML model. Fig. A.4 (c) and (f) provide a summarized view of the final value allocation between data creators and the data packager under data Shapley and asymmetric data Shapley-based valuation. The results indicate that the total Shapley values allocated to data creators decrease after data augmentation, signaling a transfer of data value from creators to the packager. In essence, this shows that the data Shapley method does not effectively protect the copyright of the original data. In contrast, with the asymmetric data Shapley method, the total value allocated to data creators remains unchanged following augmentation. Meanwhile, the value allocated to the data packager reflects only the performance gains achieved through meaningful augmentation, utilizing the class-wise efficiency of asymmetric data Shapley under ICU-WS (see Proposition 4.1 in the main article). This suggests that asymmetric data Shapley provides a fairer and more equitable allocation within this data market scenario.

C.3.2 A Different Data Market Setting

Experimental Setup. In this section, we explore a different data market scenario where multiple contributors contribute data sequentially over time, with data from all previous periods being disclosed to contributors in subsequent periods. The objective is to train and update the ML model as new data arrives in each period, with each contributor being compensated based on the value of their data. We simulate this scenario using data values from the Traffic dataset, as calculated in Section 6.2 of the main article. In this setup, three contributors contribute data sequentially: the first contributes 748 observations from July, followed by the second with 650 observations from August, and finally, the third provides 478 observations from September 2013. The goal is to train




Figure A.4: The allocation to the data creators and the data packager based on KNN-Shapley and KNN-Asymmetric-Shapley under the data augmentation scenario.

and update a decision tree classifier to predict whether hourly traffic volume will exceed 3,500 as high-quality new data is incorporated each month. Fig. A.5 illustrates the allocation of monetary values to these contributors based on the KNN-DS and KNN-ADS methods. The heights of the blue, orange, and green bars represent the total values of data from July, August, and September, corresponding to the monetary allocations for the first, second, and third contributors, respectively.

Analysis. In Fig. A.5 (a), the total value allocated to the first contributor decreases significantly as data from later periods is added to the training dataset, indicating a transfer of value from the first contributor to those in subsequent periods. The more data that is added from later periods, the less value the first contributor retains. This suggests that the data Shapley method may not effectively protect the contributions of data collected in the initial period. Conversely, Fig. A.5 (b) illustrates that, under the asymmetric data Shapley method, the total value allocated to the first contributor remains constant, even as data from later periods is incorporated. The values assigned to the second and third contributors reflect the incremental performance gains achieved by adding new data in their respective periods (see Proposition 4.1 in the main article). These findings indicate that the asymmetric data Shapley provides a fairer and more equitable allocation approach in data market scenarios with sequential dependencies.




Figure A.5: The allocation to multiple data creators who contributes data sequentially over time.