Abstract
Finding and describing sub-populations that are exceptional regarding a target property has important applications in many scientific disciplines, from identifying disadvantaged demographic groups in census data to finding conductive molecules within gold nanoparticles. Current approaches to finding such subgroups require pre-discretized predictive variables, do not permit non-trivial target distributions, do not scale to large datasets, and struggle to find diverse results.

To address these limitations, we propose SYFLOW, an end-to-end optimizable approach in which we leverage normalizing flows to model arbitrary target distributions, and introduce a novel neural layer that results in easily interpretable subgroup descriptions. We demonstrate on synthetic and real-world data, including a case study, that SYFLOW reliably finds highly exceptional subgroups accompanied by insightful descriptions.

1. Introduction
The majority of modern machine learning focuses on finding global models that perform well on predictive tasks such as classification. Here, deep neural networks often achieve state-of-the-art performance, at the expense of human-interpretable insight.

Orthogonal to the advances in predictive modeling, many scientific applications require descriptive modeling; finding sub-populations that are somehow exceptional, and providing a human-interpretable description for these. Applications of finding such subgroups range from identifying disadvantaged demographic groups in census data (Boll & Lagemann, 2019; Ortiz & Cummins, 2011) to learning those combinations of properties that single out materials with desirable properties (Sutton et al., 2020).

The common denominator in such applications is to present the relevant subgroups to a domain expert. In other words, not only do we require to find subsets with exceptional behavior, but also, that these can clearly be interpreted by the respective audience. That is, we have a joint optimization task of learning simple descriptions of sub-populations for which the property of interest is (locally) exceptionally distributed compared to the rest of the dataset. Typically, such a description is a conjunction of predicates, each based on the features of the dataset. For example, on census data with wage as the target property, a subgroup description could be “Women without higher education” (Fig. 1a), where we find that their salary is exceptionally low (Fig. 1b).

Since the introduction of subgroup discovery by Klösgen, several approaches have been proposed (Atzmueller, 2015a). However, they have not kept up with the recent advances in machine learning. Prior approaches suffer from three main limitations. First, due to combinatorial optimization, these methods are limited to small datasets. Second, most methods assume that the target follows a simple, e.g. normal or binomial distribution. Although there are proposals to learn a proxy of the target distribution, their results are less interpretable. Third, previous methods require a pre-quantisation of the continuous features, which is independent of the optimization procedure. As we show in our experiments, this greatly influences the quality of the results.

To overcome these limitations, we propose SYFLOW, where we introduce three major changes:

(i) We formulate subgroup discovery as a continuous optimization problem based on KL-divergence. This enables first-order optimization, which significantly improves runtime and performance.

(ii) We leverage Normalizing Flows (Rezende & Mohamed, 2015a) to accurately learn the target distribution from data, enabling us to deal with intricate real-world distributions.

(iii) To learn interpretable subgroup descriptions, we propose a neuro-symbolic rule learner that in an end-to-end fashion learns the conjunction predicates that best describe a subgroup as well as the corresponding discretization.

We extensively evaluate SYFLOW on synthetic and real-world data, comparing against state-of-the art methods. We show that SYFLOW accurately and reliably learns and char-
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Figure 1. Subgroups. SYFLOW learns subgroups, named subpopulations of which the distribution of the target variable is exceptional. In (a) SYFLOW precisely describes the subgroup of “Women without higher education”, whose distribution of the target quantity wage is significantly lower (b). In general, SYFLOW is applicable on any data with non-trivial target distributions, e.g. material science (c).

2. Preliminaries

We consider a dataset of $n$ pairs $(x, y)$, where $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ represents a property of interest, the target property, and $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is a feature vector. From a statistical perspective, we assume $(x, y)$ is a realisation of a pair of random variables $(X, Y) \sim P(X, Y)$. We denote random variables by capitals, write $p$ for their density, and $P$ for their law.

We are interested in learning subgroups for which the conditional distribution of the target attribute $P_Y|S = 1$ is exceptional compared to $P_Y$. A subgroup membership function, or rule, $\sigma(x) \in \{0, 1\}$ determines whether a sample $x$ belongs to the subgroup (1) or not (0). Formally, it is a conjunction $\sigma : x \mapsto \land_{i=1}^{m} \pi(x_i)$ of Boolean-valued predicates $\pi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, where each predicate defines an interval over which its output is 1, e.g. “18 $>$ age $>$ 65”.

To permit continuous optimization, we consider soft predicates $\hat{\pi} \in [0, 1]$. These are smooth functions that model the probability of a sample $x$ to be inside an interval $\alpha < x < \beta$. We can control the steepness of the transition via a temperature parameter $t$. We write $s(x) \in [0, 1]$ to denote a soft rule based on soft predicates, and $S \in \{0, 1\}$ for the indicator (random) variable that $s$ defines, i.e. $P(S = 1|X = x) = s(x)$. Note that by reducing $t$ to 0 we again obtain binary predicates and rules that are easy to interpret.

3. Method

In this section we introduce SYFLOW for learning exceptional subgroups by end-to-end maximization of KL-divergence. We first give an overview and then the details.

3.1. Overview

A subgroup is characterized by a membership function $\sigma$, which is commonly constrained to be a directly interpretable rule, i.e. a logical conjunction over predicates $\pi$. Finding the rule that identifies the most exceptional conditional distribution of the target is an NP-hard combinatorial problem (Boley & Grosskreutz, 2009).

We propose to take a different, end-to-end optimizable approach to learning subgroups. To this end we propose a continuous relaxation $s$ of the binary-valued rule function, which is designed to be differentiable, avoiding the need for pre-discretization, yet directly give interpretable results. We propose to optimize the exceptionality of a subgroup in terms of KL-divergence between the conditional distribution $P_{Y|S = 1}$ and the marginal distribution $P_Y$ of the target, where we model these distributions non-parametrically using Normalizing Flows – with the added benefit that we have a single solution for univariate or multivariate targets.

As our entire framework is differentiable, we can optimize all components with gradient descent, which as we will see is often both faster and more performant than combinatorial approaches. Finally, our framework naturally enables iteratively learning multiple non-redundant subgroups by regularizing with the similarity of already learned subgroups.

3.2. Differentiable Rule Induction

Subgroup membership is defined by a logical conjunction over binary predicates $\sigma : x \mapsto \land_{i=1}^{m} \pi(x_i; \alpha_i, \beta_i)$. Predi-
Our key idea is to redefine a subgroup membership function in probabilistic terms, such that we obtain a function that acts akin to logical conjunctions but at the same time are differentiable and therewith optimizable using gradient descent. In particular, we propose to associate each feature \( x_i \) with a **soft predicate**

\[
\hat{\pi}(x_i; \alpha_i, \beta_i, t) = \frac{e^{\frac{1}{t} (2x_i - \alpha_i)}}{e^{\frac{1}{t} (2x_i - \alpha_i)} + e^{\frac{1}{t} (3x_i - \alpha_i - \beta_i)}}
\]

where we adapt the idea of approximate and differentiable splits from deep decision trees (Yang et al., 2018) to use a lower and upper bound \( \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R} \), and introduce a temperature parameter \( t > 0 \) that controls the steepness of the function at these bounds. The lower the temperature, the less soft the predicate, and in the limit of \( t \to 0 \) a soft predicate converges to a strict predicate. In Fig. 2a we show an example soft predicate for different temperatures.

Theorem 1 Given its lower and upper bounds \( \alpha_i, \beta_i \in \mathbb{R} \), the soft predicate of Eq. (3.2) applied on \( x \in \mathbb{R} \) converges to the crisp predicate that decides whether \( x \in (\alpha, \beta) \).

\[
\lim_{t \to 0} \hat{\pi}(x_i; \alpha_i, \beta_i, t) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \alpha_i < x_i < \beta_i \\ 0.5 & \text{if } x_i = \alpha_i \lor x_i = \beta_i \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}
\]

We provide the full proof for the general case with \( M \) bins in the Appendix A.

The soft predicate \( \hat{\pi} \) provides a differentiable, adaptable binning function. Next, we propose to combine the predicates \( \hat{\pi}_i \) for each feature \( x_i \) into a soft rule \( s \) that acts akin to logical conjunctions but remains differentiable. It is possible to model a logical conjunction using multiplication, but this leads to vanishing gradients (Hochreiter, 1998), which is problematic especially for non-trivial amounts of soft predicates (features). The harmonic mean

\[
\mathcal{M}(x) = \frac{p}{\sum_{i=1}^{m} \hat{\pi}(x_i; \alpha_i, \beta_i, t)^{-1}}
\]

behaves as desired for strictly binary predicates, i.e. \( \exists \hat{\pi}(x_i; \alpha_i, \beta_i, t) = 0 \Rightarrow \mathcal{M}(x) = 0 \) and \( \forall \hat{\pi}(x_i; \alpha_i, \beta_i, t) = 1 \Rightarrow \mathcal{M}(x) = 1 \), but tends to break down when given many soft predicates, e.g. when considering a high dimensional feature space. To avoid this, we propose to instead use the **weighted harmonic mean** to model logical conjunctions, and construct the soft rule function \( s \) as

\[
s(x; \alpha, \beta, a, t) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m} a_i \hat{\pi}(x_i; \alpha_i, \beta_i, t)^{-1}}{\sum_{i=1}^{m} a_i}. \tag{2}
\]

The weights \( a \in \mathbb{R}^m \), which are constrained to be positive through a ReLU function, allow the conjunction layer to disable unnecessary predicates. The weights do not affect behavior for strictly binary predicates, wherever \( a_i > 0 \).

We show an example subgroup membership function for a soft rule \( s \) in Fig. 2b. The subgroup here is characterized by a conjunction of two predicates on \( X_1 \) and \( X_2 \), i.e. a box, with a gradual, smooth transition from subgroup inclusion to exclusion at the boundaries.

In general, our formulation of a soft rule is completely flexible in regards to the thresholds of the binned features, and asymptotically for \( t \to 0 \) is equivalent to a strict rule.

3.3. Differentiable Density Estimation

Besides a differential rule function, we require accurate estimations of the conditional resp. marginal distributions of the target. We deviate from existing work by taking a differentiable non-parametric approach in the form of Normalising Flows. These are an increasingly popular class of density estimators (Rezende & Mohamed, 2015b; Dinh et al., 2017; Papamakarios et al., 2021). The fundamental idea behind a normalising flow is to start with a distribution with a known density function, e.g. a Gaussian distribution with \( p_N \), and fit an invertible function \( f \) to transform it onto the target density.

Our method, SyFLOW, allows to seamlessly use any normalising flow architecture. In this work, our architecture of choice are Neural Spline Flows (Durkan et al., 2019), which use expressive yet invertible piece-wise, polynomial spline functions. In general, the idea is to train the function \( f \) so that \( p_y \approx f(p_N) \). Given a sample \( y \), we can compute the likelihood of that point under the current function \( f \) as \( p_{f/N}(y) = p_N(f^{-1}(y)) \det \left( \frac{\delta f^{-1}(y)}{\delta y} \right) \). Thus, given a sample of \( p_Y \), we can maximise the likelihood of \( p_{f/N}(y) \) and hence fit \( p_{f/N} \approx p_Y \).

3.4. Differentiable Exceptionality Measure

We now have a differentiable rule function \( s \) and versatile density estimate \( p_Y \) resp. \( p_Y|S=S \) of the target distribution. Next, we propose a differentiable measure of exceptionality

---

**Figure 2.** Example soft predicate (a) and soft rule (b).
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between the conditional target distribution and the marginal target distribution. We adopt the Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence and show how we can reformulate it towards this goal. We start with the standard definition,

$$D_{KL}(P_{Y|S=1}||P_Y) = \int_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} p_{Y|S=1}(y) \log \left( \frac{p_{Y|S=1}(y)}{p_Y(y)} \right) dy.$$  

(3)

Here, the soft rule \(s\) does not explicitly appear, which is needed to take gradients. Towards this, we rewrite the first occurrence of \(p_{Y|S=1}\) in Eq. (3.4) as

$$p_{Y|S=1}(y) = \int_{x \in \mathbb{R}^m} p_{Y|S=1,x}(y|x)p_x(x)dx = \int_{x \in \mathbb{R}^m} p_{Y|S=1,x}(y|x)\frac{p_{Y=1|x}(x)p_x(x)}{P(S=1)}dx,$$  

(4)

by using the rules of marginal probability resp. Bayes’ rule. We will first approximate Eq. (3.4), and then subsequently show how we can estimate KL divergence of Eq. (3.4) for its optimization.

To this end, we first note that the subgroup indicator \(S\) takes two discrete values, indicating whether \(x\) belongs to the subgroup. The rule function \(s(x)\) is deterministic in the limit of \(t \to 0\) as per Theorem 1. We use this to partition the domain of integration \(\mathbb{R}^m\) into \(\mathbb{R}^m_S := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^m|s_{t \to 0}(x) = 1\}\) and \(\mathbb{R}^m_{\neg S} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^m|s_{t \to 0}(x) = 0\}\). Under the following four assumptions we can bound the approximation of density \(p_{Y|S=1}\) in Eq. (3.4). First, we assume that both \(p_x\) and \(p_{Y|S=1,x}\) are upper bounded by the finite constants \(C_x > 0\) and \(C_Y > 0\), respectively. Secondly, we assume that in a subset \(\mathbb{R}^m_{S \subseteq C} \subset \mathbb{R}^m_{S}\), where \(s\) is neither zero or one, i.e., the yellow region in Figure 2b, is negligible. Lastly, we assume that \(\mathbb{R}^m_{\neg S}\) covers almost all of the non-membership domain \(\mathbb{R}^m_{\neg S}\) and the probability mass area is also negligible. Formally, \(p_x(x) \leq C_x\), \(p_{Y|S=1,x} \leq C_Y\),

$$\int_{x \in \mathbb{R}^m_{S \subseteq C}} p_{S=1|x}(x)dx \leq \epsilon_1,$$  

(5)

$$\int_{x \in \mathbb{R}^m_{\neg S \subseteq C}} p_x(x)dx < \epsilon_2.$$  

(6)

Theorem 2 When Eqs. (3.4), (3.4), and (3.4) hold, it is

$$p_{Y|S=1}(y) - \int_{x \in \mathbb{R}^m_{S \subseteq C}} p_{Y|S=1,x}(y|x)p_x(x)dx \leq \frac{C_Y(\epsilon_2 + \frac{C_x}{P(S=1)})}{P(S=1)}.$$  

Further, during learning, this bound becomes tighter until it asymptotically vanishes, assuming a decreasing annealing schedule for the temperature parameter.

We postpone the proof to Appendix B.

Using the same assumptions, we further approximate for all \(x \in \mathbb{R}^m\) the target property conditional

$$p_{Y|x}(y|x) = p_{Y|S=1,x}(y|x)p_{S=1|x}(x) + p_{Y|S=0,x}(y|x)p_{S=0|x}(x) \approx p_{Y|S=1,x}(y|x),$$

which allows us to approximate the subgroup-conditional target distribution from Eq. (3.4) as

$$p_{Y|S=1}(y) = \int_{x \in \mathbb{R}^m_{S \subseteq C}} p_{Y|S=1,x}(y|x)\frac{p_{S=1|x}(x)p_x(x)}{P(S=1)}dx \approx \int_{x \in \mathbb{R}^m_{S \subseteq C}} p_{Y|x}(y|x)\frac{p_{S=1|x}(x)}{P(S=1)}dx.$$  

(9)

Finally, we replace Eq. (3.4) into Eq. (3.4) to obtain our final approximation

$$D_{KL}(P_{Y|S=1}||P_Y) \approx \int_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \int_{x \in \mathbb{R}^m_{S \subseteq C}} p_{Y|x}(y|x)\frac{p_{S=1|x}(x)}{P(S=1)}dx \log \left( \frac{p_{Y|S=1}(y)}{p_Y(y)} \right) dy.$$  

From this point onward we can use the standard Monte Carlo estimation of this integral, which gives

$$D_{KL}(P_{Y|S=1}||P_Y) \approx \frac{1}{n_s} \sum_{k=1}^{n_s} s(x^{(k)}) \log \left( \frac{p_{Y|S=1}(y^{(k)})}{p_Y(y^{(k)})} \right),$$  

where \(p_Y\) and \(p_{Y|S=1}\) stand for the models trained from the normalising flows. \(s\) is our subgroup membership model (see Sec. 3.2) and \(n_s\) is estimated as \(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} s(x^{(i)})\). Our approximation is directly computable given the density estimates \(p_Y\) and \(p_{Y|S=1}\) from the normalizing flows. Crucially this allows us to update the subgroups rule \(s\) as to maximize its exceptionality/KL-Divergence. Finally, we can now deal with some fine tuning of the objective to discover both representative and diverse subgroups.

3.5. Rule Generality and Diversity

The KL-divergence measures dissimilarity between two distributions, but naively maximising it has a drawback. We could easily craft a small subgroup consisting of the most deviating sample on its own, defined by a rule with a very narrow scope and relatively low value. Thus, we employ a common technique in subgroup discovery (Boley et al., 2017) in order to steer the results towards larger subgroups: we multiply the statistic of dissimilarity with the size of the subgroup \(n_s^\gamma\). The power \(\gamma\) tunes the trade-off in the importance of subgroup exceptionality and size.

As we will show in our experiments, traditional subgroup discovery approaches often find a set of nearly identical
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subgroups. In the typical top-k scheme, the best scored subgroups are often slight variations of the same rule. To encourage SYFLOW to learn subgroups with diverse distributions, we introduce a regularizer, where we add the KL-divergence of the current subgroup $S$ to the previously found subgroups $S_k$ to our objective. Hence, summarising all the above, we obtain as our final objective our variant of the size-corrected KL (van Leeuwen & Knobbe, 2011)

$$D_{WKL}(P_{Y|S=1} \| P_Y) = n_s^2 D_{KL}(P_{Y|S=1} \| P_Y) + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^J D_{KL}(P_{Y|S=1} \| P_{Y|S_j=1}) .$$

The parameter $\lambda$ controls the strength of the regularizer.

3.6. Full Model

In the previous sections, we detailed our rule learning architecture with differentiable thresholding and aggregation (Sec. 3.2). We described how to use Neural Spline Flows to obtain non-parametric density estimates (Sec. 3.3), and finally derived Objective (3.5), a size aware Kullback-Leibler Divergence that allows us to optimize our rule function $s(x)$ with gradient descent. Together these make up the components of our SYFLOW architecture for subgroup discovery with normalising flows. Given a dataset $\{(x^{(k)}, y^{(k)})\}_{k=1}^N \sim P(X, Y)$, SYFLOW undergoes the following three steps for each sample $(x^{(k)}, y^{(k)})$:

1. Feature Thresholding: All continuous features $x_i^{(k)}$ are thresholded with learned parameters $\alpha_i$ and $\beta_i$ using the soft-binning from Eq. (3.2). Thereby we obtain a predicate vector $\bar{\pi}(x^{(k)}; \alpha, \beta, t) \in [0, 1]^p$.

2. Subgroup Rule: We employ weights $a_i$ to combine the individual predicates $\bar{\pi}_i(x_i^{(k)})$ into a conjunction $s(x; \alpha, \beta, a, t)$. This rule represents the probability of subgroup membership $P(S = 1|X = x^{(k)})$.

3. Distribution Exceptionality: We estimate the likelihood of $p_Y(y^{(k)})$ and $p_{Y|S=1}(y^{(k)})$ with two separately fitted normalising flow models. Then, according to Objective (3.5), we can estimate the KL-Divergence between the current subgroup and the general distribution.

By repeating the aforementioned steps over all samples $(x^{(k)}, y^{(k)})$ and summing up the results, Objective (3.5) gives us a differentiable estimate of the KL-Divergence in regards to the subgroup rule $s(x)$. We optimize $s(x)$ using standard gradient descent techniques with the Adam optimizer (Kingma & Ba, 2015). After the subgroup rule has been updated, we again update the normalising flow of the subgroups density as described in Sec. 3.3, and repeat this process for a user-specified amount of epochs. During the training, we gradually decrease the temperature $t$ by a pre-determined schedule to obtain increasingly crisp subgroup assignments. Finally, at the last epoch, the discovered subgroup is then the output of the subgroup rule $s(x)$. We provide a diagram overviewing and the pseudo-code for SYFLOW in the Appendix C.

4. Related Work

Subgroup Discovery. Traditional approaches for subgroup discovery (Klösgen, 1996) can be split based on type of search and on exceptionality measures. Subgroup discovery is NP-hard (Boley & Grosskreutz, 2009) and hence most proposals resort to greedy heuristics (Duivesteijn et al., 2016; Atzmueller, 2015b) without guarantees. Branch-and-bound based algorithms (Boley et al., 2017; Kalofolias et al., 2019) permit results with guarantees for some exceptionality measures, but generally do not scale beyond tens of features (Atzmueller & Puppe, 2006).

Most proposals for subgroup discovery assess exceptionality by comparing the conditional and marginal distributions of a single univariate target (Song et al., 2016; Helal, 2016). Basic measures of exceptionality include mean-shift (Grosskreutz & Rüping, 2009) for continuous, and weighted relative accuracy (Song et al., 2016) for discrete targets, but there exists a wide range of proposals for many data types (Kalofolias et al., 2019). Most, however, make strong assumptions about the distribution of the target such as normal (Friedman & Fisher, 1999; Lavrač et al., 2004), binomial or $\chi^2$ (Grosskreutz & Rüping, 2009).

Duivesteijn et al. (2016) generalize subgroup discovery to multivariate targets by measuring exceptionality based on the difference between models just trained on the subgroup versus on all of the data. Due to computational costs, only simple models can be used, leading to a compromise in performance. Similarly, Izzo et al. (2023) search for subgroups that can be described by a linear model. Proença et al. (2022) instead measure exceptionality using a proxy of KL-divergence based on the Minimum Description Length (MDL) principle. In contrast, SYFLOW optimizes KL-divergence directly, can employ any type of normalizing flow, and is equally suited for uni-/multi-variate targets.

Differentiable Rule Induction Classical rule induction methods aim to find rules of the form “If $X_1 = 1 \land X_5 = 1$ Then $Y = 0$” through expensive combinatorial optimization. Recently, highly scalable differentiable rule induction methods were proposed based on differentiable combinatorial optimization methods (Fischer & Vreeken, 2021; Wang et al., 2020) that permit extracting crisp logical rules after training. Most work in this direction focuses on learning a global classifier (Yang et al., 2018; Qiao et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2021; Dierckx et al.,
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Figure 3. Subgroup Predictive Accuracy. (a) Method comparison in terms of F1-score recovering subgroups in synthetic data. (b) Across different distributions: SYFLOW outperforms the competition on distributions with higher order moments. (c) With increasing number of cutpoints, SD-µ matches SYFLOW accuracy around 40 bins, but needs 10× more time.

2023) as opposed to our goal of learning concise rule that identify exceptional subgroups. In this sense most related is Walter et al. (2024), who propose a neural architecture to find conjunctions of binary features that are over resp. under-expressed for a particular label. In contrast, SYFLOW considers continuous features, and is not constrained to a type or number of target variables.

5. Experiments

We evaluate SYFLOW against four state-of-the-art methods on synthetic and real-world data. We compare against Bump Hunting (BH, Friedman & Fisher, 1999), subgroup discovery using mean-shift (SD-µ, Lemmerich & Becker, 2018), subgroup discovery using KL-divergence (SD-KL), and Robust Subgroup Discovery (RSD, Proença et al., 2022). We give the hyperparameters in Appendix D and provide the code in the Supplementary Material.

5.1. Synthetic Data

To evaluate on datasets with known ground truth we consider synthetic data. We begin by generating $m$ feature variables $X$, and the target variable $Y$ from a uniform distribution $\mathcal{U}(0,1)$ to create a dataset of $n = 20,000$ samples. Within this dataset, we plant a rule $\sigma(x) = \Lambda(x; \alpha, \beta)$ of $c$ conditions. The hypercube described by the rule is set to have a volume of 0.1 (10% of population). For the samples within the planted subgroup, we re-sample the target variable $Y$ using a separate distribution $\mathbb{P}(Y | S = 1)$. We run each experiment five times and report the average.

Target Distribution First, we assess for all methods their accuracy in recovering the planted subgroup for different distributions of the target property $Y$. To this end, we vary $\mathbb{P}(Y | S = 1)$ to be respectively a normal distribution $\mathcal{N}(1.5, 0.5)$, uniform distribution $\mathcal{U}(0.5, 1.5)$, exponential distribution $\mathcal{E}(0.5)$, rayleigh distribution $\mathcal{R}(2)$, cauchy distribution $\mathcal{C}(0, 1)$, beta distribution $\mathcal{B}(0.2, 0.2)$, and a balanced mixture distribution of two gaussians (Bi-$\mathcal{N}$) $\mathcal{N}(-1.5, 0.5)$ and $\mathcal{N}(1.5, 0.5)$. The distribution are shown in Figure 8 in Appendix G. The number of features $m = 10$ and complexity $c = 4$ remains fixed.

For each method, we compute the F1-score between the ground truth and discovered subgroup labels (i.e. $S = 1$). We present our results in Figure 3a; We see that for distributions that are well characterized by their first moment, i.e. the uniform and normal distribution, SYFLOW, SD-µ and BH are all able to recover the planted subgroup. On the exponential, Rayleigh and bi-modal distributions, only SYFLOW finds the planted subgroup. In general, SYFLOW reliably recovers subgroups independent of the underlying target distribution.

Thresholding Next, we study the efficacy of the differentiable feature thresholding. We generate data as before, considering only Normal distributions for the target variable $Y$, and setting $m = 50$. We compare the accuracy of SYFLOW against SD-µ, whilst gradually increasing the amount of bins per feature in the pre-processing for SD-µ.

As we can see in Figure 3b, as the number of cutpoints increases, the F1-score of SD-µ improves. Under 20 cutpoints SD-µ performs much worse than SYFLOW, while for more cutpoints it slightly outperforms it in terms of accuracy. At the same time, as the number of cutpoints increases, SD-µ runtime increases rapidly (Figure 3c), requiring an order of

Figure 4. Scalability of SYFLOW and baselines.
Cross the board, $S_{BC}$ and hence it is not surprising that it outperforms $S_{SD}$-KL. The scale of $D_{KL}$, $SD$-KL finds the subgroup with the largest mean difference. For further analysis, we plot the best three subgroups found by $S_{YFLOW}$ and $SD$-KL in Figure 5a and 5b. The specific rules that $S_{YFLOW}$ finds are succinct and informative ("¬Smoker & Age < 36"), and represent a diverse set of subgroups (low, medium and high premiums). In contrast, SD-KL finds highly redundant rules, e.g. "¬Smoker" and "¬Smoker & Age > 18", that all describe the same target distribution.

Generally, on all datasets where the target variable is exponentially distributed (Wages, Insurance, California), $S_{YFLOW}$ performs well in any measured metric, which matches the results seen on the exponential synthetic data (Sec. 5.1). Finally, in Fig. 5c,5d, we plot the learned subgroups on the Wages dataset mentioned in the introduction. Again, $S_{YFLOW}$ finds diverse subgroups of disadvantaged demographics ("Female & Low Education") and advantaged groups ("Male & White & Age > 38"), whilst its competitor find either much less exceptional subgroups (RSD,BH) or variants of the same subgroup (SD-$\mu$,SD-KL).

Overall, $S_{YFLOW}$ shows versatility in finding exceptional subgroups across a variety of datasets and metrics. The discovered rules are succinct and diverse, can scale to large datasets, and are robust to the underlying target distribution. In the following, we will use $S_{YFLOW}$ on a specific application in materials science.

5.3. Case Study: Materials Science

Next, we consider a case study on materials science data (Goldsmith et al., 2017), an application where learning diverse exceptional subgroups has a clear scientific benefit. In particular, we consider a dataset of properties of gold-nano-clusters. These are key components in photo-voltaics, as well as in medical applications (Giljohann et al., 2020). The key goal is to better understand which molecular configurations lead to materials with better properties in terms

Table 1. Quantitative results of exceptionality of the subgroups discovered by resp. SYFLOW (ours), SD-KL, SD-μ, RSD, and BH, as measured KL-Divergence ($D_{KL}$, higher is better), Bhattacharyya coefficient (BC, lower is better), and absolute mean distance (AMD, higher is better).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$D_{KL}$</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>$BC$</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>$AMD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ours</td>
<td>SD-KL</td>
<td>SD-μ</td>
<td>RSD</td>
<td>BH</td>
<td>ours</td>
<td>SD-KL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abalone</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airquality</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automobile</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td><strong>0.72</strong></td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mpg</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td><strong>0.81</strong></td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wine</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. rank</td>
<td><strong>1.5</strong></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td><strong>1.4</strong></td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We first focus on characterizing the HOMO-LUMO gap, the difference between the highest occupied and lowest unoccupied molecular orbit, which corresponds to the efficiency in energy absorption of the material for photons of specific frequencies. Gold nano-clusters are also increasingly used in medical applications, in which the HOMO-LUMO gap is crucial to determine their reactivity with other molecules. We explored the problem of discovering a diverse set of exceptional subgroups, where the distribution of the target within each subgroup differs significantly from the overall target distributions. Existing works suffer from combinatorial explosion, can not deal with intricate real world distributions and heavily depend on the pre-quantisation of the features. To overcome these limitations, we propose SYFLOW, where we formulate subgroup discovery as continuous optimization problem. We use normalizing flows to accurately learn the distribution of the target property, enabling us to deal with arbitrary complicated distributions, and propose a differentiable rule learner, which simultaneously learns the subgroup description and the corresponding discretization. We show on synthetic and real-world data, including a case study on gold nano-clusters, that SYFLOW reliably discovers diverting subgroups, especially when the target distribution is non-standard. On gold nano-clusters we find physically plausible subgroups.

6. Conclusion

We explored the problem of discovering a diverse set of exceptional subgroups, where the distribution of the target within each subgroup differs significantly from the overall target distributions. Existing works suffer from combinatorial explosion, can not deal with intricate real world distributions and heavily depend on the pre-quantisation of the features. To overcome these limitations, we propose SYFLOW, where we formulate subgroup discovery as continuous optimization problem. We use normalizing flows to accurately learn the distribution of the target property, enabling us to deal with arbitrary complicated distributions, and propose a differentiable rule learner, which simultaneously learns the subgroup description and the corresponding discretization. We show on synthetic and real-world data, including a case study on gold nano-clusters, that SYFLOW reliably discovers diverting subgroups, especially when the target distribution is non-standard. On gold nano-clusters we find physically plausible subgroups.

A current limitation of all subgroup discovery methods, including SYFLOW, is that the description language of conjunctions of Boolean predicates may be to simple to describe complex subgroups for physical data. We are specifically interested in exploring how we can extend SYFLOW to perform symbolic regression (Ouyang et al., 2018).
Broader Impact

The main motivation of the work presented in this paper, is to develop a method, which can assist practitioners to make new scientific discovery. For example, new insights on gold-cluster can have potential impact on biomedical applications and more efficient photovoltaic system. However, when applied to sensitive census data, it is important to stress that SYFLOW is based on correlations and is thus not capable to make a definite causal statement.
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A. Proof of Asymptotic Correctness of Soft-Binning

**Proof:** Consider a real value \( x_i \in \mathbb{R} \) and \( M \) sorted bin thresholds \( \beta_{i,j} \in \mathbb{R} \), i.e., \( \beta_{i,j} < \beta_{i,j+1} \). From the thresholds \( \beta_{i,j} \), we construct the bias vector \( b_i \in \mathbb{R}^{M+1} \) defined as

\[
b_i = (0, \sum_{j=1}^{1} -\beta_{i,j}, \ldots, \sum_{j=1}^{M} -\beta_{i,j})^T.
\]

Additionally, we define a weight vector \( w \in \mathbb{R}^{M+1} \) with \( w_j = j \), so that

\[
w = (1, 2, \ldots, M + 1)^T.
\]

The soft-binning result \( z \in [0, 1]^{M+1} \) is defined as

\[
z = \text{softmax}(w(\bar{x}_i + b_i)/t).
\]

Now, let \( x_i \) be in the \( l \)-th bin, i.e., \( \beta_{i,l-1} < x_i < \beta_{i,l} \), then we now firstly prove that \( \forall j \neq l : z_l > z_j \). We do this by showing that the \( l \)-th logit \( z_l = w_l x_i + b_{l,t} \) is the largest and hence also has the highest softmax activation.

Firstly, note that the bin thresholds are sorted in order, so that for \( j < l \) it also holds that \( \beta_{i,j} < \beta_{i,l} \). \( \bar{z}_l \) is defined as

\[
\bar{z}_l = w_l x_i + b_{l,t} = w_l x_i - \sum_{k=1}^{l-1} \beta_{i,k}.
\]

We can simply transform \( \bar{z}_l \) into \( \bar{z}_{l-1} \) by subtracting \( x_i - \beta_{i,l-1} \), so that

\[
\bar{z}_l - x_i + \bar{z}_{l-1} = w_{l-1} x_i - \sum_{k=1}^{l-2} \beta_{i,k} = \bar{z}_{l-1}.
\]

Now, as \( x_i \) is in the \( l \)-th bin, we know that \( \beta_{i,l-1} < x_i \) and hence \( x_i - \beta_{i,l} < 0 \). For all other \( j < l \) \( \beta_{i,j} < x_i \) holds, and hence also \( \bar{z}_l > \bar{z}_j \).

Now consider the case where \( j > l \). Here, it holds that

\[
\bar{z}_l + x_i - \beta_{i,l+1} = w_{l+1} x_i - \sum_{k=1}^{l+1} \beta_{i,k} = \bar{z}_{l+1}.
\]

In general, we may transform \( \bar{z}_l \) into \( \bar{z}_j \) by repeatedly adding \( x_i - \beta_{i,k} \) for \( k \in [l + 1, \ldots, j] \). For all thresholds \( x_i < \beta_{i,k} \) holds. Thus, each time we add a strictly negative number to the logit \( \bar{z}_i \), which proves that also here \( \forall j > l : \bar{z}_i > \bar{z}_j \). Thus, it holds that \( \forall j \neq l : \bar{z}_l > \bar{z}_j \).

Lastly, it remains to prove that with temperature \( t \to 0 \), \( z \) is a one-hot bin encoding, i.e., \( z_l = 1 \) and \( \forall j \neq l : z_j = 0 \). The soft-binning of \( \bar{z}_l \) is defined as

\[
\lim_{t \to 0} \bar{z}_l = \lim_{t \to 0} \frac{\exp(\bar{z}_l/t)}{\sum_{j=1}^{M+1} \exp(\bar{z}_j/t)} = \lim_{t \to 0} \frac{1}{\sum_{j=1}^{M+1} \exp ((\bar{z}_j - \bar{z}_l)/t)}.
\]

For \( j = l \), the sum term evaluates to \( \exp(\bar{z}_l - \bar{z}_l)/t = \exp(0) = 1 \). For \( j \neq l \), it holds that \( \bar{z}_l > \bar{z}_j \) as show previously, and hence in the limit

\[
\lim_{t \to 0} \exp(\bar{z}_j - \bar{z}_j)/t = \exp(-\infty) = 0.
\]

Thus, in the limit \( t \to 0 \), the denominator sums up to 1 and hence \( \bar{z}_l = 1 \), and as the softmax is positive and sums up to zero, it follows that \( \forall j \neq l : z_j = 0 \). \( \square \)
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B. Proof of Theorem 3

Theorem 3 When Eqs. (3.4), (3.4), (3.4), and (3.4) hold, it is

\[ p_{Y|S=1}(y) - \int_{X \in \mathbb{R}^m_x} p_{Y|S=1,x}(y, x) \leq \frac{C_{Y}(\epsilon_2 + C_{X}\epsilon_1)}{\mathbb{P}(S=1)} \cdot dX. \]

Further, during learning, this bound becomes tighter until it asymptotically vanishes, assuming a decreasing annealing schedule for the temperature parameter.

Proof: We first recall that, under our model, \( p_{S=1|x}(x) = s_{t \rightarrow 0}(x; \alpha, \beta) \) for some \( \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}^n \), and is therefore a smooth function of \( x \). Intuitively, there are two regions of interest within \( \mathbb{R}^m \), one within which it transitions from the value of almost 1 to that of almost 0, which is the region \( \mathbb{R}^m_{\notin C} \), and a saturation region, where \( p_{S=1|x} \rightarrow 0 \) super-exponentially, which is the region \( \mathbb{R}^m_{\in C} \). The particular thresholds that define these regions are not important, and any reasonable scheme leads to vanishing bounds \( \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2 \).

More formally, using the partitioning of \( \mathbb{R}^n \), we can split the integral of Eq. (3.4) into

\[ p_{Y|S=1}(y) = \int_{x \in \mathbb{R}^m} p_{Y|S=1,x}(y, x) \frac{p_{S=1|x}(x)p_X(x)}{\mathbb{P}(S=1)} dX + \int_{x \in \mathbb{R}^m} p_{Y|S=1,x}(y, x) \frac{p_{S=1|x}(x)p_X(x)}{\mathbb{P}(S=1)} dX, \]

with the goal to upper bound (and hence ignore) the second term, which we consider as an error. This second term can be now bounded as

\[
\int_{x \in \mathbb{R}^m} p_{Y|S=1,x}(y, x) \frac{p_{S=1|x}(x)p_X(x)}{\mathbb{P}(S=1)} dX \leq \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(S=1)} \int_{x \in \mathbb{R}^m} C_Y p_{S=1|x}(x)p_X(x) dX \leq \frac{C_Y}{\mathbb{P}(S=1)} \left[ \int_{x \in \mathbb{R}^m \setminus \mathbb{R}^m_{\notin C}} p_{S=1|x}(x)p_X(x) dX + \int_{x \in \mathbb{R}^m_{\notin C}} p_{S=1|x}(x)p_X(x) dX \right] \leq \frac{C_Y}{\mathbb{P}(S=1)} \left[ \int_{x \in \mathbb{R}^m \setminus \mathbb{R}^m_{\notin C}} p_X(x) dX + C_X \int_{x \in \mathbb{R}^m_{\notin C}} p_{S=1|x}(x) dX \right] \leq \frac{C_Y (\epsilon_2 + C_{X}\epsilon_1)}{\mathbb{P}(S=1)},
\]

where \( p_{S=1|x} \leq 1 \) since \( S \) is a discrete random variable.

We argue about the second part by claiming that both bounds \( \epsilon_1 \) and \( \epsilon_2 \) vanish during learning. Indeed, the form \( s(x) \rightarrow p_{S=1|x}(x) \) satisfies the assumption of Eq. (3.4) for a steep enough temperature parameter \( t \), while it is also learning the correct domain \( \mathbb{R}^m_{\notin C} \), so that indeed the assumption of Eq. (3.4) is satisfied, both with inexorably diminishing bounds \( \epsilon_1 \) and \( \epsilon_2 \), respectively. \( \square \)
C. Algorithm and Hyperparameters

In this section, we provide pseudocode for SYFLOW.

**Algorithm 1: fit_flow** ($\{x^{(1)}, \ldots, x^{(n)}\}, \{y^{(1)}, \ldots, y^{(n)}\}, s, p, \bar{p}$)

1. $\log L \leftarrow \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \log [p(y^{(i)}) \cdot s(x^{(i)}) + \bar{p}(y^{(i)}) \cdot (1 - s(x^{(i)}))];$
2. $\text{loss} \leftarrow -\log L;$
3. loss.backwards();
4. Update $p$;

**Algorithm 2: SYFLOW** ($X, Y, \text{epochs}_{\text{Flow}_Y}, \text{epochs}_{\text{Flow}_Y^s}, \text{lr}_{\text{Flow}_Y}, \text{lr}_s, \text{priors}, \gamma, \lambda, t$)

1. $p_Y \leftarrow \text{Neural Spline Flow};$
2. for $i \leftarrow 1$ to $\text{epochs}_{\text{Flow}_Y}$ do
   3. $\log L \leftarrow \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \log [p_Y(y^{(i)})];$
   4. $\text{loss} \leftarrow -\log L;$
   5. loss.backwards();
   6. Update $p_Y$;
   7. $\alpha_i \leftarrow \min X_i;$
   8. $\beta_i \leftarrow \max X_i;$
   9. $a_i \leftarrow 1;$
   10. $\text{Rule}(x) \leftarrow s(x; \alpha, \beta, a, t);$ 
   11. $p_{Y|S=1} \leftarrow \text{Neural Spline Flow};$
   12. $p_{Y|S=0} \leftarrow \text{Neural Spline Flow};$
   13. for $i \leftarrow 1$ to $\text{epochs}_{\text{Flow}_Y^s}$ do
      14. Compute subgroup membership probabilities $s(x^{(i)});$ 
      15. $\text{KL} \leftarrow \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} s(x^{(i)}) \cdot (\log [p_{Y|S=1}(y^{(i)})] - \log [p_Y(y^{(i)})]);$
      16. $n_s \leftarrow \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} s(x^{(i)});$ 
      17. Weighted-$\text{KL} \leftarrow \text{KL} \cdot \bar{s}^\gamma;$
      18. Regularizer $\leftarrow 0;$
      19. for $p_{SG_k} \text{ in priors}$ do
         20. Regularizer $\leftarrow$ Regularizer + $\frac{\lambda}{\text{prior}_k}$ \cdot $\text{Regularizer};$
      21. $\text{loss} \leftarrow$ Weighted-$\text{KL} - \text{Regularizer};$
      22. loss.backwards();
      23. Update rule $s$ to minimize objective/maximize weighted, regularized KL;
      24. $\text{fit_flow}(\{x^{(1)}, \ldots, x^{(n)}\}, \{y^{(1)}, \ldots, y^{(n)}\}, s, p_{Y|S=1}, p_{Y|S=0});$
      25. if $(t = \text{epochs}_{\text{Flow}_Y^s} / 2) \lor (t = \text{epochs}_{\text{Flow}_Y^s} \cdot 3/4)$ then
         26. $t \leftarrow t/2;$
   27. return $\text{Rule}, p_{Y|S=1};$
D. Hyperparameters for experimental evaluation

For all methods we optimize their respective hyperparameters such to maximize the measures used to evaluate the experiments. Since, BH has no hyperparameters no fine-tuning is required.

D.1. Synthetic experiments

We used one hyperparameter setting for all synthetic experiments For SYFLOW the hyperparameter setting is: \( t = 0.2, \gamma = 0.5, \lambda = 0.5, I_{\text{flow}} = 5 \times 10^{-2}, I_r = 2 \times 10^{-2}, \text{epochs}_{\text{Flowy}} = 2000 \) and epochs\(_{\text{Flowy}} = 1500\). For SD-\( \mu \), SD-KL and RSD, we used 20 cutpoints and a beamwidth of 100, while \( \gamma \) is set to 1.0. Although \( \gamma \) has for all approaches the same functionality i.e. control the size of the subgroup, the absolute value of a \( \gamma \) has drastically different meanings. As SYFLOW outputs a soft assignment, we require a smaller alpha to achieve the same effect. For example, if SYFLOW assigns 0.9, then contribution to the size correction for \( \gamma = 0.5 \) is \( \sqrt{0.9} \approx 0.95 \), thus we require a smaller \( \gamma \).

D.2. Real world data

For the experiments on Kaggle and UCI data (i.e. Section 5.2), we used for SYFLOW: \( t = 0.2, \gamma = 0.3, \lambda = 2.0, I_{\text{flow}} = 5 \times 10^{-2}, I_r = 2 \times 10^{-2}, \text{epochs}_{\text{Flowy}} = 1000 \) and epochs\(_{\text{Flowy}} = 1000\). For SD-\( \mu \), SD-KL and RSD, we used 20 cutpoints, a beamwidth of 100, while \( \gamma \) is set to 1.0. For the experiments on gold cluster data present in Figure 1c, we used epochs\(_{\text{Flowy}} = 7000\), epochs\(_{\text{Flowy}} = 3000\), \( \lambda = 10.0 \) and \( \gamma = 0.2 \). For the case study, we used epochs\(_{\text{Flowy}} = 3000\), epochs\(_{\text{Flowy}} = 2000\), \( \lambda = 5 \) and \( \gamma = 0.2 \).

E. Evaluation metric

To objectively evaluate the discovered subgroups on real-world data, we use Bhattacharyya coefficient (BC), KL-divergence (KL) and absolute mean distance (AMD) between the distribution of the subgroup \( P_{Y|S=1} \) and overall distribution of \( P_Y \). KL and AMD are size corrected, since both metrics are heavily influenced by the size of the subgroup. We use histogramms to estimate the probability distributions. The edges of the bins are computed using the Freedman Diaconis Estimator, which is robust to outliers and less sensitive towards distribution shapes. For the subgroup distribution \( P_{Y|S=1} \) and overall distribution \( P_Y \), the metrics are formally defined as

\[
BC(P_{Y|S=1}, P_Y) = \sum_{y \in Y} \sqrt{p_{Y|S=1}(y)p_Y(y)}
\]

\[
D_{KL}(P_{Y|S=1}, P_Y) = \sum_{y \in Y} p_{Y|S=1}(y) \log\left(\frac{p_{Y|S=1}(y)}{p_Y(y)}\right)
\]

\[
AMD(Y_s, Y) = \left| \frac{1}{|Y_s|} \sum_{y \in Y_s} y - \left( \frac{1}{|Y|} \sum_{y \in Y} y \right) \right|.
\]

In the last definition, with slight abuse of notation, we used \( Y_s \) to denote all points in the subgroup. For the Table 1, we size corrected KL and AMD using \( \gamma = 1 \). Note, this is exactly the metric that SD-\( \mu \) and SD-KL optimize.

F. Rule Complexity Experiment

We study how SYFLOW learns subgroups of increasing complexity. This is achieved by increasing the number of predicates in a generated rule up to ten. We keep the target distribution fixed to a Normal distribution.

We present our results in Figure 7: Here, as the complexity of the rule increases, the accuracy of all methods generally decreases as the task becomes progressively harder. Amongst all methods, SYFLOW recovers the planted subgroup with the highest accuracy. In particular, SYFLOW improves the most over its competitors on the more complex subgroups.

G. Target distributions for synthetic experiment

In Figure 8, we show the different target distributions for the first synthetic experiment.
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Figure 7. F1 under increasingly complex rules, higher is better

Figure 8. Here, we show the different target distributions for second synthetic experiment in Section 5.

H. Subgroup descriptions

We show in Table 2 further examples of subgroups found on the real life datasets. For each method we select the first subgroup that the respective method found. Since BH did not find relevant subgroups for most datasets, we do not consider it in the table.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Rule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abalone</td>
<td>SYFLOW</td>
<td>0.20 &lt; whole-weight &lt; 2.83 &amp; 0.13 &lt; viscera-weight &lt; 0.60 &amp; 0.26 &lt; shell-weight &lt; 1.00 &amp; sex-I = 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd-KL</td>
<td>shell-weight ≥ 0.43 &amp; 0.46 ≤ diameter &lt; 0.49 &amp; shocked-weight &lt; 0.55 &amp; whole-weight ≥ 1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd-μ</td>
<td>height ≥ 0.10 &amp; shocked-weight ≥ 0.16 &amp; shell-weight ≥ 0.11 &amp; shell-weight ≥ 0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airquality</td>
<td>SYFLOW</td>
<td>404.67 &lt; NOx(GT) &lt; 1479.00 &amp; -44.90 &lt; NO2(GT) &lt; 340.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd-KL</td>
<td>PT08.S4(NO2) ≥ 2026.0 &amp; PT08.S3(NOx) &lt; 373.0 &amp; month ≥ 11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd-μ</td>
<td>PT08.S1(CO) ≥ 1285.0 &amp; NMHC(GT) &lt; 185.0 &amp; PT08.S2(NMHC) &lt; 1086.0 &amp; NOx(GT) &lt; 326.0 &amp; NOx(GT) ≥ 200.0 &amp; PT08.S5(O3) ≥ 1780.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd-μ</td>
<td>PT08.S1(CO) ≥ 956.0 &amp; PT08.S2(NMHC) ≥ 979.0 &amp; PT08.S5(O3) ≥ 704.0 &amp; PT08.S5(O3) ≥ 917.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automobile</td>
<td>SYFLOW</td>
<td>If 159.42 &lt; length &lt; 208.10 &amp; 60.64 &lt; width &lt; 72.00 &amp; 2684.19 &lt; curb-weight &lt; 4066.00 &amp; 64.84 &lt; engine-size &lt; 270.46 &amp; 7.00 &lt; compression-ratio &lt; 19.11 &amp; 16.00 &lt; highway-mpg &lt; 31.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd-KL</td>
<td>&amp; jaguar=0 &amp; mercedes-benz=0 &amp; plymouth=0 &amp; subaru=0 &amp; fuel-type-gas=1 &amp; engine-location-front=1 &amp; engine-location-rear=0 &amp; engine-type-ohcv=0 &amp; fuel-system-2bl=0 &amp; fuel-system-mpli=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd-μ</td>
<td>&amp; body-style-convertible=0 &amp; engine-size ≥ 161.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd-μ</td>
<td>highway-mpg &lt; 30.0 &amp; honda=0 &amp; isuzu=0 &amp; plymouth=0 &amp; subaru=0 &amp; curb-weight ≥ 2385.0 &amp; fuel-system-mfi=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>SYFLOW</td>
<td>holidays=0 &amp; 1.00 &lt; weathersit &lt; 2.35 &amp; 0.47 &lt; atemp &lt; 0.78 &amp; 0.18 &lt; hum &lt; 0.83 &amp; season-I=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd-KL</td>
<td>&amp; temp &lt; 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd-μ</td>
<td>temp ≥ 0.26 &amp; atemp ≥ 0.28 &amp; hum &lt; 0.87 &amp; windspeed &lt; 0.34 &amp; season-I=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd-μ</td>
<td>temp ≥ 0.40 &amp; temp ≥ 0.43 &amp; hum &lt; 0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>SYFLOW</td>
<td>0.50 &lt; MedInc &lt; 2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd-KL</td>
<td>MedInc ≥ 7.4 &amp; 35.0 ≤ HouseAge &lt; 38.0 &amp; -121.19 ≤ Longitude &lt; -118.34 &amp; AveBedrms ≥ 0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Med-μ</td>
<td>MedInc ≥ 5.11 &amp; MedInc &lt; 6.16 &amp; HouseAge &lt; 52.0 &amp; AveOccup ≥ 2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd-μ</td>
<td>MedInc ≥ 3.32 &amp; AveOccup &lt; 3.89 &amp; AveOccup &lt; 4.33 &amp; Latitude ≤ 37.99 &amp; Longitude ≤ -117.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>SYFLOW</td>
<td>44.00 &lt; age &lt; 64.00 &amp; smoker=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd-KL</td>
<td>smokers=1 &amp; bmi ≥ 30.0 &amp; age ≥ 59.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd-μ</td>
<td>smoker=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd-μ</td>
<td>smoker=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mpg</td>
<td>SYFLOW</td>
<td>3.35 &lt; cylinders &lt; 5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd-KL</td>
<td>weight ≥ 3845.0 &amp; 71.0 ≤ model-year &lt; 74.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd-μ</td>
<td>displacement ≥ 151.0 &amp; weight ≤ 2671.0 &amp; weight ≥ 3085.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd-μ</td>
<td>cylinders=4.0 &amp; weight &lt; 2807.0 &amp; weight ≥ 4278.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>SYFLOW</td>
<td>school=1 &amp; address=0 &amp; failures=0 &amp; schoolsup=1 &amp; nursery=0 &amp; higher=0 &amp; internet=1 &amp; 1.00 &lt; Dalc &lt; 3.34 &amp; Medu-I=0 &amp; Fedu-I=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd-KL</td>
<td>failures=1 &amp; famsize=1 &amp; absences &lt; 1 &amp; famsup=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd-μ</td>
<td>failures=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd-μ</td>
<td>school=0 &amp; higher=0 &amp; absences ≤ 16 &amp; absences ≤ 18 &amp; failures=0 &amp; schoolsup=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages</td>
<td>SYFLOW</td>
<td>sex=0 &amp; 10.68 &lt; ed &lt; 18.00 &amp; 29.86 &lt; age &lt; 95.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd-KL</td>
<td>ed ≥ 18.0 &amp; 37.0 ≤ age &lt; 43.0 &amp; sex=0 &amp; height &lt; 70.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd-μ</td>
<td>race-other=0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd-μ</td>
<td>height ≥ 65.05 &amp; height ≥ 65.79 &amp; sex=0 &amp; age ≥ 30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wine</td>
<td>SYFLOW</td>
<td>0.23 &lt; volatile acidity &lt; 1.10 &amp; 0.99 &lt; density &lt; 1.04 &amp; 8.00 &lt; alcohol &lt; 10.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd-KL</td>
<td>alcohol ≥ 12.75 &amp; 29.0 &lt; free sulfu dioxide &lt; 41.0 &amp; pH &lt; 3.24 &amp; 0.26 ≤ citric acid/0.34 &amp; residual sugar ≥ 1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd-μ</td>
<td>free sulfu dioxide ≥ 11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd-μ</td>
<td>fixed acidity &lt; 8.30 &amp; alcohol ≥ 10.40 &amp; free sulfu dioxide ≥ 11.0 &amp; total sulfu dioxide &lt; 195.0 &amp; density &lt; 1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Symbolic subgroup descriptions for real life datasets in Section 5.2