

GLANCE: Global Actions in a Nutshell for Counterfactual Explainability

Loukas Kavouras^{1,†,*}, Eleni Psaroudaki^{2,1,†,*}, Konstantinos Tsopelas¹, Dimitrios Rontogiannis³, Nikolaos Theologitis¹, Dimitris Sacharidis^{4,5}, Giorgos Giannopoulos¹, Dimitrios Tomaras⁷, Kleopatra Markou⁶, Dimitrios Gunopulos⁶, Dimitris Fotakis^{2,8}, and Ioannis Emiris^{1,6}

¹*Institute for the Management of Information Systems, Athena Research Center, Greece*

²*Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, National Technical University of Athens, Greece*

³*Max Planck Institute for Software Systems, Kaiserslautern, Germany*

⁴*Université Libre de Bruxelles, Belgium*

⁵*FARI Institute, Belgium*

⁶*Department of Informatics and Telecommunications, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Greece*

⁷*Department of Informatics, Athens University of Economics and Business, Greece*

⁸*Archimedes, Athena Research Center, Greece*

[†]*Corresponding authors: Loukas Kavouras - kavouras@athenarc.gr , Eleni Psaroudaki - epsaroudaki@mail.ntua.gr*

**Equal Contribution*

November 18, 2025

Abstract

The widespread deployment of machine learning systems in critical real-world decision-making applications has highlighted the urgent need for counterfactual explainability methods that operate effectively. Global counterfactual explanations, expressed as actions to offer recourse, aim to provide succinct explanations and insights applicable to large population subgroups. High effectiveness, measured by the fraction of the population that is provided recourse, ensures that the actions benefit as many individuals as possible. Keeping the cost of actions low ensures the proposed recourse actions remain practical and actionable. Limiting the number of actions that provide global counterfactuals is essential to maximizing interpretability. The primary challenge, therefore, is to balance these trade-offs—maximizing effectiveness, minimizing cost, while maintaining a small number of actions. We introduce **GLANCE**, a versatile and adaptive algorithm that employs a novel agglomerative approach, jointly considering

both the feature space and the space of counterfactual actions, thereby accounting for the distribution of points in a way that aligns with the model’s structure. This design enables the careful balancing of the trade-offs among the three key objectives, with the size objective functioning as a tunable parameter to keep the actions few and easy to interpret. Our extensive experimental evaluation demonstrates that **GLANCE** consistently shows greater robustness and performance compared to existing methods across various datasets and models.

1 Introduction

Machine learning models are increasingly deployed in critical domains such as loan approvals, hiring, and healthcare. This widespread adoption intensifies the need for transparency and interpretability in model decisions, requiring users to understand how their input features influence the outcomes and how they might change them to achieve favorable outcomes, known as recourse [26]. Counterfactual explanations have gathered extensive attention for their suitability for achieving algorithmic recourse [20], their interpretability [34], actionability [32], utility in fairness audits [29, 22], etc. A counterfactual action, or simply an *action*, defines the specific feature changes that convert an unfavorable decision into a favorable one.

Traditionally, counterfactual explanations refer to *local explainability* tied to a specific negatively affected instance. However, many real-world scenarios require *global counterfactual explainability*, which provides shared, population-level explanations. While collecting all local counterfactuals could technically cover all affected individuals, this approach undermines interpretability, a core requirement of global explainability.

Building on prior research [28, 19], we define Global Counterfactual Explanations (GCEs) as a small set of *global actions* designed to provide effective recourse for the affected population. Any global counterfactual solution must meet three objectives: (1) be composed of a small number of actions to ensure interpretability (small size), (2) minimize the cost of implementing those actions (low cost), and (3) offer recourse to as many affected individuals as possible (high effectiveness).

As noted by Branke [3], the relationships between multiple optimization objectives are often complex, and aggregating them into a single objective, even though common in practice [28], can be problematic since they are typically non-commensurable. Framing GCEs as multi-objective optimization allows us to explore the inherent *trade-offs* between effectiveness and cost, especially when the solution size is constrained.

To understand this optimization problem, assume a 2-d numerical feature space, and consider the two affected instances x_1, x_2 depicted in Fig. 1a. Assume that the recourse cost equals the distance to the decision boundary, drawn as a line in the figure. Observe that a_1 (resp. a_2) is the local action providing recourse for x_1 (resp. x_2) at minimum cost.




Figure 1: A toy example depicting two negative instances x_1, x_2 , and five actions. (a) The feature space; the line is the decision boundary. (b) The action space; l_1, l_2 depict the decision boundary from the perspective of x_1, x_2 , respectively.

Further, consider the *action space* depicted in Fig. 1b, where every action is represented as a point (or equivalently a vector relative to the center o of the coordinate system). The blue l_1 and red l_2 lines represent the decision boundary seen from the perspectives of x_1 and x_2 , respectively. The blue line l_1 separates the actions that provide recourse for x_1 (any action on the outside, away from o) from those that do not. Action a_1 lies on l_1 , and is the closest point to o , and thus the min-cost local action for x_1 . Similarly, the red line l_2 concerns x_2 and contains its min-cost action a_2 .

Consider now the problem of finding a *single action* GCE. To provide recourse for both x_1 and x_2 , we look for an action that lies outside both lines in Fig. 1b. Among all such actions, a_3 has the minimum cost and thus is the optimal global action that maximizes effectiveness. If we trade off effectiveness for cost, a_2 is the optimal global action that minimizes cost, but has 50% effectiveness (brings recourse to x_2 but not to x_1).


Finding GCEs gives rise to a different optimization problem than its local counterpart, and requires a nuanced exploration of the action space. Even if optimal local actions are generated for each instance and a small subset is chosen as the global actions, this may still result in a suboptimal set of GCEs. In our example, the optimal global action a_3 is not an optimal local action for either x_1 or x_2 ; in fact, a_3 can be viewed as a compromise between a_1 and a_2 , the locally optimal actions.

Key Contributions First, we formally introduce Global Counterfactual Explanations (GCEs) as small, interpretable sets of actions that provide recourse to large population subgroups. A user study confirms that smaller action sets yield more intuitive and practical explanations.

Second, we formulate the problem of finding GCEs as a multi-objective op-

GLANCE (3 Actions) → eff: 99.79% , avc: 5.03 Action 1: F1:-5.7, F2:-211.4 Action 2: F1:-19.1, F2:-299.6 Action 3: F1:-26.1, F2:-98.6
GLOBE-CE (3 Actions) → eff: 78.4% , avc: 52.35 Action 1: F1:-159.8, F2:+48.9 Action 2: F1:-319.6, F2:+97.9 Action 3: F1:-479.4, F2:+146.8
GLOBE-CE (67 Actions) → eff: 99.6% , avc: 5.15 Action 1: F1:-1, F2:-0.29 ... Action 67: F1:-264.9, F2:+81.1

(a) Actions



(b) Effectiveness vs Recourse cost

Figure 2: Comparison of GCEs on the COMPAS dataset using an XGBoost model. (a) GCEs generated by GLANCE ($s=3$) and GLOBE-CE ($s=3$ & default $s=67$). (b) Effectiveness–recourse cost curves showing the share of individuals (y-axis) achieving recourse below a given cost (x-axis); the area under the curve reflects the average recourse cost. Costs follow Sec. 5.

timization task, balancing effectiveness and cost under a size constraint. We compare our formulation to prior approaches, such as that of Ley et al. [25], and highlight its interpretability advantages. We prove that a restricted version of the problem is NP-hard, motivating the need for efficient algorithms.

Third, we propose GLANCE, a novel algorithm that clusters individuals in both feature and action space to generate diverse and coherent counterfactuals. Our results show that proper use of clustering can lead to higher quality GCEs, contradicting the claims of Kanamori et al. [19].

Finally, extensive experiments across models and datasets show that GLANCE *Pareto dominates* baselines, i.e., achieves higher effectiveness and lower cost, in 57% of cases (and is dominated in only 1%). A user study further supports its practical appeal even when it is not formally dominant.

2 Related Work

Counterfactual Explanations There has been a plethora of work focusing on counterfactual explanations [see e.g., 17, 33, and references therein]. An overview of methods of algorithmic recourse, which provides explanations and recommendations to individuals impacted by automated decision-making systems, is presented by Karimi et al. [20]. These methods can be either model-agnostic [e.g., 34] or model-specific [e.g., for trees as in 6], may focus on specific properties such as diversity [27], feasibility [32] or robustness [31], and may follow different methodological paradigms such as optimization-based approaches [10, 21] or instance-based approaches [11, 5, 30], target local or global explanations. While local counterfactuals are well defined, global ones present challenges

as they must provide recourse for all individuals within a specific group in the same manner while maintaining explainability and staying true to the notion of local counterfactuals, which focuses on minimal changes. Achieving this balance globally presents notable difficulties.

Global Counterfactuals Rawal and Lakkaraju [28] introduced **AReS**, a framework for global counterfactual explanations that jointly optimizes recourse correctness, coverage, and cost, providing an interpretable summary of recourses, expressed in a two-level rule set. However, the **AReS** framework may fail to cover the entire population. Ley et al. [24] later improved the computational efficiency with **Fast AReS**. In another direction, Kanamori et al. [19] introduced **CET**, which partitions the space and assigns an action to each part transparently and consistently. Although effective, its computational complexity limits scalability. Warren et al. [35] developed **Group-CF**, which generates counterfactuals that seek to maximize effectiveness, though it can result in higher costs.

Actions vs Directions Ley et al. [25] proposed **GLOBE-CE**, where global counterfactual explainability is defined differently, as a small set of action *directions* along which individuals can “move” to achieve recourse. **GLOBE-CE** attacks a different optimization problem from ours. For the toy example in Fig. 1, the single direction that minimizes the total recourse cost for x_1 and x_2 is the direction d depicted in Fig. 1b. This direction contains actions a_4 and a_5 that bring recourse to x_2 and x_1 , respectively, with minimum cost *along* d . However, neither a_4 nor a_5 is optimal as a GCE (or for local explainability). Even the set $\{a_4, a_5\}$ is a suboptimal GCE—the set $\{a_1, a_2\}$ dominates it with equal size and effectiveness but lower total cost. In general, (1) translating **GLOBE-CE** outputs into GCE leads to numerous micro-actions (two in our example, but potentially as many as the individuals’ number), which reduces interpretability, (2) choosing a few actions along the optimal directions may result in suboptimal GCEs (any single action along d is dominated by a in Fig. 1), and (3) since directions lack clear endpoints, they fail to specify the required magnitude of change, creating uncertainty for individuals seeking recourse and limiting real-world applicability.

Therefore, **GLOBE-CE** relaxes the CGE formulation, ignoring size. Fig. 2 compares the output of **GLANCE** to that of **GLOBE-CE**. By default, **GLOBE-CE** (green line) produces 67 micro-actions. With such a wide range of actions available, most individuals can achieve recourse through low-cost actions, resulting in high effectiveness and low average cost— at the expense of interpretability. When restricted to three actions (orange line), **GLOBE-CE** experiences a sharp decline in effectiveness and a substantial increase in average cost. In contrast, **GLANCE** (blue line), thanks to its effective exploration of the action space, produces high-quality GCEs (with high effectiveness and low average cost) without sacrificing interpretability (just three actions).

Other Other works include the ones of Carrizosa et al. [7, 8], who use mixed-integer quadratic models for group-level explanations, and Koo et al. [23], who employ Lagrangian methods. Research has also extended to generating global counterfactuals for graphs [18] and auditing subgroup fairness [22, 15].

3 Problem Formulation and Hardness

We consider a black box binary classifier $h : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}$, where the positive outcome is favorable and the negative outcome is unfavorable. We will focus on the set $\mathcal{X}_{\text{aff}} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ of adversely affected individuals, i.e., those who receive the unfavorable outcome. We denote as \mathbb{A} the set of all possible actions (which is potentially infinite), where an action $a \in \mathbb{A}$ is a set of changes to feature values, e.g., $a = \{\text{country} \rightarrow \text{US}, \text{education-num} \rightarrow +2\}$, which, when applied to an instance $x \in \mathcal{X}_{\text{aff}}$, results in a counterfactual instance $x' = a(x)$. Every action a has a cost, denoted as $\text{cost}(a, x)$, and is effective for an instance x if $h(a(x)) = h(x') = 1$. Let $\mathbb{C} \subseteq \mathbb{A}$. The recourse cost $\text{rc}(\mathbb{C}, x)$ of an instance x is the minimum cost incurred from an effective action in \mathbb{C} :

$$\text{rc}(\mathbb{C}, x) = \min\{\text{cost}(a, x) \mid a \in \mathbb{C} : h(a(x)) = 1\} \quad (1)$$

Let $X_{\mathbb{C}} = \{x \in \mathcal{X}_{\text{aff}} \mid h(a(x)) = 1, a \in \mathbb{C}\}$ be the set of instances that flip their prediction using one of the actions in \mathbb{C} . Then the effectiveness, also known as coverage [24], of \mathbb{C} for the affected instances \mathcal{X}_{aff} is defined as the percentage of \mathcal{X}_{aff} that managed to flip their prediction using one of the actions in \mathbb{C} :

$$\text{eff}(\mathbb{C}, \mathcal{X}_{\text{aff}}) = \frac{|X_{\mathbb{C}}|}{|\mathcal{X}_{\text{aff}}|},$$

The cost of \mathbb{C} in \mathcal{X}_{aff} is defined as the average recourse cost of the instances in \mathcal{X}_{aff} :

$$\text{avc}(\mathbb{C}, \mathcal{X}_{\text{aff}}) = \frac{\sum_{x \in X_{\mathbb{C}}} \text{rc}(\mathbb{C}, x)}{|X_{\mathbb{C}}|}.$$

Finally, let $\text{size}(\mathbb{C}) = |\mathbb{C}|$ denote the cardinality of a set \mathbb{C} .

As it is clear, multiple sets of actions can produce recourse for \mathcal{X}_{aff} , and the quality of such a set is a factor of the three notions we introduced: effectiveness, cost, and size. An ideal global counterfactual should maximize effectiveness while minimizing the cost and the size, based on the properties that state-of-the-art works [28, 19, 25, 18] have argued are essential. The requirement for a small set of actions is to enhance the interpretability of the explanation. This can also be expressed as a constraint on the set size we can afford [28]. Therefore, instead of minimizing the size, we constrain it to $\text{size}(\mathbb{C}) \leq s$, where s is a small positive integer (set to four for our empirical evaluation). For the rest of the paper, we will use the following problem formulation:

Problem 1 (s -GCE). *Given a black box model h that classifies the \mathcal{X}_{aff} instances to the negative class, our goal is to find the set $\mathbb{C} \subseteq \mathbb{A}$ that represents a solution to the following multiobjective optimization problem:*

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && \left(-\text{eff}(\mathbb{C}, \mathcal{X}_{\text{aff}}), \text{avc}(\mathbb{C}, \mathcal{X}_{\text{aff}}) \right) \\ & \text{s.t.} && \text{size}(\mathbb{C}) \leq s \end{aligned}$$

We next show that a very restricted case of s -GCE is computationally difficult in the worst case.

Theorem 2 (NP-hardness). *The special case of s -GCE, where the model h and the set of allowable actions \mathbb{A} are explicitly given and the cost is ignored, is NP-hard.*

We prove that the decision version of the following special case of s -GCE is NP-complete. The input consists of a model h , a finite set of affected instances $\mathcal{X}_{\text{aff}} = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$, a finite set of allowable actions $\mathbb{A} = \{a_1, \dots, a_m\}$ and a positive fractional number $E \in \mathbb{Q}$. We seek to determine if there is a subset of actions $\mathbb{C} \subseteq \mathbb{A}$ with $\text{size}(\mathbb{C}) \leq s$ and $\text{eff}(\mathbb{C}, \mathcal{X}_{\text{aff}}) \geq E$. We assume that the model h is defined only on $\mathcal{X}_{\text{aff}} \cup \{a_i(x_j) \mid a_i \in \mathbb{A} \text{ and } x_j \in \mathcal{X}_{\text{aff}}\}$ and its full description is given as part of the input. For the hardness part, we reduce Max s -Cover to the special case of s -GCE above. Max s -Cover is known to be NP-complete [16, SP5] and inapproximable in polynomial time [13, Theorem 5.3]. For the full proof, we refer the reader to Appendix A.

The fact that the very restricted special case of s -GCE in Theorem 2, where the model h and the set of allowable actions \mathbb{A} are explicitly given, is NP-hard (and NP-hard to approximate) indicates the computational challenges behind producing good enough solutions to s -GCE in practical settings, where we only have black-box access to h , the action cost is important and the set of allowable actions \mathbb{A} is unknown and potentially infinite.

A key step of any approach is to efficiently generate a representative subset $\mathbb{A}' \subseteq \mathbb{A}$ of candidate actions, significantly larger than s , from which the final set of s actions can be carefully chosen. Since actions that perform well locally may not generalize well as GCEs (as discussed, e.g., in Fig. 1), a myopic action selection (either as representative actions in \mathbb{A}' or as actions in the final solution \mathbb{C}) may fail to produce results anywhere close to optimal. To further clarify this point, we note that effectiveness is a nondecreasing submodular function of the chosen actions set \mathbb{C} (and so well-fit for the standard greedy approach), but the average cost function is non-monotone in \mathbb{C} , because its definition averages over the set of instances that receive recourse under \mathbb{C} . At a conceptual level, increasing the size of \mathbb{C} may either leave effectiveness mostly unchanged, while potentially reducing the average cost, or improve effectiveness at an increased cost for the instances just added to $X_{\mathbb{C}}$ (which might increase the average cost). Therefore, the addition of new actions must carefully balance gains in effectiveness without disproportionately increasing the average cost.

The discussion above aims to underscore the challenging trade-off between size, effectiveness, and average cost. Our method addresses this challenge by




Figure 3: Intuition behind clustering approaches. (a) First, **GLANCE** generates diverse candidate actions from the centroids of feature-based clusters. (b) Then, **GLANCE** merges clusters based on similarity in both feature and action space, grouping instances that may be further apart but can be explained by similar actions. (c) Clustering solely in feature space can yield suboptimal global actions, trading high effectiveness for high cost or low cost for low effectiveness.

employing clustering in both feature and action space to ensure diversity and global representativeness of the preselected action set A' , thus maintaining high effectiveness and low average cost. A detailed analysis of how action set size impacts effectiveness and cost is provided in Appendix B.

4 GLANCE

We present **GLANCE**, a novel algorithm for solving Problem 1. **GLANCE** is described in Algorithm 1 in pseudocode.

Algorithm Description. The algorithm operates in two phases. (1) *Diverse Counterfactual Actions Generation.* In the first phase, the algorithm produces a set of counterfactual actions while balancing the action diversity and sparsity (i.e., the number of actions). The goal is to efficiently and effectively explore the action space by generating actions from widely dispersed points within the feature space and guiding them in diverse directions that cross the decision boundary. This is achieved by employing a clustering algorithm (e.g., k -means, line 1, alg. 1) to partition the feature space into k clusters, based on the assumption that nearby points are likely to share similar views of the boundary. We compute the *centroid* of each cluster and generate m *diverse* counterfactual actions for each centroid (line 3, alg. 1), employing any candidate counterfactual generation method (see Appendix G for the methods used in the experimental evaluation). Fig. 3a shows an example with four fine-grained clusters, where three diverse actions are generated per centroid. Each action represents an alternative way to bring recourse to cluster members, giving **GLANCE** the flexibility to later select among them.

Algorithm 1 GLANCE

Input: \mathcal{X}_{aff} , m , k , s { \mathcal{X}_{aff} := affected individuals, m := number of candidate actions to generate, k := initial number of clusters, s := number of global counterfactual actions}

Output: s global counterfactual actions

```
1:  $C \leftarrow \text{cluster}(\mathcal{X}_{\text{aff}}, k)$  {Cluster  $\mathcal{X}_{\text{aff}}$  into  $k$  initial clusters}
2: for  $c \in C$  do
3:    $\text{ca}(c) \leftarrow \text{actions}(\text{centroid}(c), m)$ 
     {For each cluster centroid generate  $m$  actions}
4: end for
5: while  $|C| > s$  do
6:    $\{c_1, c_2\} \leftarrow (\underset{\{c_1, c_2\} \subseteq C}{\text{argmin}} d_1(\text{centroid}(c_1), \text{centroid}(c_2))$ 
      $+ d_2(\text{ca}(c_1), \text{ca}(c_2)))$ 
     {Find  $c_1, c_2$  minimizing  $d_1 + d_2$ }
7:    $C \leftarrow \text{merge}(\{c_1, c_2\} \in C)$  {Replace  $c_1, c_2$  in  $C$  with the merged cluster}
8:    $\text{ca}(\{c_1, c_2\}) \leftarrow \text{ca}(c_1) \cup \text{ca}(c_2)$  {Merge their action sets}
9: end while
10: return best action from each of the  $s$  clusters
```

(2) *Extracting an optimal set of CGEs.* In the second phase, we identify a final set of s actions from those produced in Phase 1. The approach combines the most similar clusters with the similarity function taking into account both their feature proximity and the proximity of their respective actions. Specifically, similarity is computed by a metric D , which is the sum of two components: $d_1 : \mathcal{X}_{\text{aff}} \times \mathcal{X}_{\text{aff}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the distance between the centroids of each cluster, and $d_2 : 2^{\mathbb{A}} \times 2^{\mathbb{A}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the distance between the action set of the clusters. The distance d_2 can be defined as the Wasserstein distance of the sets, though simpler formulations are also possible, e.g., computing the distance between the average counterfactual actions of each cluster; in the remainder of the paper, we adopt the latter formulation of d_2 for computational efficiency. When similar actions bring recourse to individuals, it is easier to identify a common low-cost, highly effective action, even though they are dissimilar feature-wise. Fig. 3b shows an example where red-colored individuals are grouped through affinity either in the feature or in the action space. Until the desired number s of clusters is reached, the algorithm iteratively merges (line 7, alg. 1) the two clusters that minimize the total distance $d_1 + d_2$ (line 6, alg. 1). Merging two clusters also merges their corresponding action sets, ensuring that the most effective actions for each cluster are retained (line 8, alg. 1).

Finally, for each of the s clusters, we select a single action and return the compact set of s global counterfactual actions (line 10, alg. 1). Assuming that action generation and subsequent merging have successfully grouped individuals that can achieve recourse through similar cost-efficient actions, the final step prioritizes effectiveness: we select, for each cluster, the optimal action in terms of effectiveness, among those associated with the cluster.

Approach Strengths As noted by Kanamori et al. [19], coarse-grained clustering approaches based solely on feature similarity lead to inadequate global actions that suffer either in cost or effectiveness (see Fig. 3c). **GLANCE** mitigates these limitations by jointly considering both feature and action-space proximity, enabling the identification of cost-effective recourse actions.

Although **GLANCE** explicitly prioritizes effectiveness, it inherently balances the effectiveness-cost trade-off. During the initial stage, refined clustering leads to diverse and typically low-cost candidate actions. In the second phase, the algorithm favors actions with maximal effectiveness, occasionally choosing higher-cost actions to achieve full coverage. For example, it may prefer an action with 100% effectiveness and an average recourse cost of 2.3 over one with 98% effectiveness and an average recourse cost of 1. However, affected individuals are ultimately free to select their preferred option among the final and applicable actions, often reducing the average recourse cost in practice.

While alternative selection strategies could explicitly incorporate cost, we deliberately avoided such heuristics. Recourse cost is often domain-specific, and **GLANCE** is designed to remain flexible for practitioners to adapt based on context and constraints.

Finally, **GLANCE** is modular and broadly applicable: it supports various clustering methods, cost metrics, and action generation techniques. As shown in Appendices I and J, different clustering methods and action generation techniques consistently lead to a near-optimal effectiveness-cost trade-off. Appendix L presents an ablation study analyzing the impact of the initial cluster number and the number of actions generated. Across all datasets and models, **GLANCE** demonstrates fast runtimes, robust performance, and high-quality solutions.

Time Complexity Let n denote the number of instances, k the number of initial clusters, s global counterfactual actions, m the number of candidate actions, and d the number of features, respectively. Define $\mathcal{T}_{\text{CF}}(d, \text{model})$ as the generation time for a single candidate counterfactual action and $\mathcal{T}_{\text{model}}$ as the black-box model’s prediction time. With k -means clustering requiring I iterations to converge, the total time complexity of **GLANCE** is:

$$\mathcal{O}(kndI + km\mathcal{T}_{\text{CF}}(d, \text{model}) + k^2(k - s)d + knm\mathcal{T}_{\text{model}})$$

We refer the reader to Appendix C for a detailed analysis.

5 Evaluation

5.1 Experimental Setting

Baselines We compare **GLANCE** framework methods against state-of-the-art methods in Global Counterfactual Explanations, specifically: **AReS** (using the **Fast AReS** implementation), **CET**, **GroupCF**, and **GLOBE-CE**, all of which are constrained by a predefined action set size. Details on the implementation of each method can be found in Appendix F.

Table 1: Evaluating the effectiveness and average recourse cost of GLANCE against Fast AReS, CET, Group-CF, GLOBE-CE, and dGLOBE-CE) GCE methods for s -GCE problem with $s = 4$. s -GCE solutions with effectiveness below 80% (practicality threshold) are highlighted in red. Non-robust GCEs, identified by either a standard deviation (std) in effectiveness greater than 5% across folds or a std in cost greater than half the average recourse cost, are highlighted in blue.

Dataset	Method	DNN		LR		XGB	
		eff	avc	eff	avc	eff	avc
Adult	Fast AReS	12.39 ± 1.06	1.0 ± 0.0	11.74 ± 2.4	1.0 ± 0.0	6.13 ± 0.42	1.0 ± 0.0
	CET	timeout	timeout	timeout	timeout	timeout	timeout
	Group-CF	100.0 ± 0.0	10.08 ± 0.03	100.0 ± 0.0	1.71 ± 0.39	96.8 ± 1.72	1.41 ± 0.54
	GLOBE-CE	99.92 ± 0.0	3.34 ± 0.29	99.92 ± 0.0	2.34 ± 0.31	82.88 ± 12.13	22.8 ± 7.87
	dGLOBE-CE	99.92 ± 0.0	10.89 ± 1.37	99.92 ± 0.0	5.91 ± 0.93	93.76 ± 1.98	64.76 ± 1.29
	GLANCE	100.0 ± 0.0	4.6 ± 0.73	100.0 ± 0.0	1.04 ± 0.07	99.85 ± 0.12	4.9 ± 3.41
COMPAS	Fast AReS	55.0 ± 0.86	1.21 ± 0.09	62.5 ± 1.82	1.24 ± 0.14	59.83 ± 3.12	1.1 ± 0.05
	CET	63.62 ± 10.35	0.96 ± 0.24	73.18 ± 4.34	1.24 ± 0.15	58.4 ± 9.3	1.06 ± 0.24
	Group-CF	100.0 ± 0.0	4.48 ± 2.53	100.0 ± 0.0	3.97 ± 2.38	100.0 ± 0.0	4.06 ± 2.10
	GLOBE-CE	100.0 ± 0.0	2.82 ± 1.06	95.74 ± 8.52	2.91 ± 0.57	87.17 ± 11.09	4.73 ± 0.92
	dGLOBE-CE	100.0 ± 0.0	7.96 ± 3.91	100.0 ± 0.0	6.71 ± 0.23	99.84 ± 0.31	12.46 ± 3.42
	GLANCE	100.0 ± 0.0	2.34 ± 0.43	100.0 ± 0.0	2.33 ± 0.38	99.51 ± 0.46	2.96 ± 0.82
Default Credit	Fast AReS	18.88 ± 2.16	1.0 ± 0.0	10.85 ± 5.45	1.07 ± 0.13	31.86 ± 5.12	1.05 ± 0.04
	CET	98.87 ± 0.62	6.32 ± 2.28	100.0 ± 0.0	3.79 ± 1.31	86.29 ± 9.94	4.5 ± 2.64
	Group-CF	79.6 ± 20.79	1.53 ± 0.62	95.4 ± 9.2	1.94 ± 1.2	95.2 ± 1.6	1.41 ± 0.64
	GLOBE-CE	81.19 ± 35.33	3.76 ± 1.35	99.94 ± 0.07	2.91 ± 1.55	83.69 ± 6.72	17.211 ± 2.22
	dGLOBE-CE	87.38 ± 18.69	5.96 ± 4.14	99.94 ± 0.07	10.38 ± 7.76	97.47 ± 0.82	42.58 ± 3.57
	GLANCE	100.0 ± 0.0	1.20 ± 0.40	100.0 ± 0.0	1.05 ± 0.11	98.13 ± 1.05	3.68 ± 1.64
German Credit	Fast AReS	52.39 ± 1.63	1.0 ± 0.0	75.27 ± 2.96	1.0 ± 0.0	51.27 ± 1.57	1.0 ± 0.0
	CET	97.3 ± 2.46	1.58 ± 0.54	96.5 ± 2.85	2.42 ± 0.24	100.0 ± 0.0	2.73 ± 0.49
	Group-CF	97.8 ± 4.4	1.85 ± 0.13	97.6 ± 2.94	9.34 ± 3.85	100.0 ± 0.0	5.78 ± 4.11
	GLOBE-CE	95.12 ± 2.04	2.11 ± 0.18	57.09 ± 20.03	2.27 ± 0.33	77.05 ± 11.26	2.52 ± 0.33
	dGLOBE-CE	97.36 ± 0.82	2.49 ± 0.27	69.89 ± 15.35	2.47 ± 0.23	86.96 ± 9.79	2.66 ± 0.77
	GLANCE	95.31 ± 3.15	1.25 ± 0.33	100.0 ± 0.0	1.21 ± 0.06	100.0 ± 0.0	1.06 ± 0.03
HELOC	Fast AReS	12.19 ± 0.58	1.03 ± 0.05	9.23 ± 1.24	1.12 ± 0.10	8.49 ± 1.32	1.16 ± 0.13
	CET	86.78 ± 10.62	8.67 ± 3.25	100.0 ± 0.0	3.57 ± 1.48	86.78 ± 6.70	12.51 ± 2.75
	Group-CF	80.4 ± 10.17	3.09 ± 0.91	90.6 ± 3.93	2.40 ± 1.38	78.4 ± 5.82	5.63 ± 1.93
	GLOBE-CE	47.18 ± 45.02	20.44 ± 24.18	99.9 ± 0.0	0.66 ± 0.10	28.33 ± 5.14	32.73 ± 0.48
	dGLOBE-CE	99.96 ± 0.05	11.07 ± 8.6	99.9 ± 0.0	1.63 ± 0.35	77.64 ± 11.51	128.0 ± 0.0
	GLANCE	99.94 ± 0.05	11.24 ± 1.37	100.0 ± 0.0	1.55 ± 0.54	98.94 ± 0.66	19.99 ± 1.91

Datasets We use four established benchmark datasets from previous research: COMPAS [1], German Credit [12], Default Credit [36], and HELOC [4]. Additionally, we introduce the Adult dataset [2] for further evaluation. Details on the datasets and their preprocessing can be found in Appendix D.

Models We trained three different model types: XGBoost (XGB), Logistic Regression (LR), and Deep Neural Network (DNN). Hyperparameters and training accuracy statistics are provided in Appendix E. We used 5-fold cross-validation to also evaluate the robustness of the results.

Recourse Cost Given the complexity of defining and computing the recourse cost for each action, we do not focus on the cost estimation and adhere to the guidelines established by Ley et al. [25]. Specifically, the cost in eq. (1) is defined as the L_1 distance between the individual and the counterfactual point, i.e., $cost(a, x) = \|x - a(x)\|_1$. For categorical features, this translates to the Hamming distance. For numerical features, this translates to the sum of the absolute differences in their values. However, due to some preprocessing (following the practices in Ley et al. [25]), the numerical features are split into 10 equal bins and their values are normalized to the bin size, resulting in a cost of one unit per decile.

Table 2: Pareto domination evaluation of solutions, for s -GCE problem with $s = 4$. The table reports the rate (number of times over available comparisons) at which **GLANCE** method dominates and is dominated by competitor methods.

GLANCE	Fast AReS	CET	GroupCF	GLOBE-CE	dGLOBE-CE	\sum_{overall}
dominates	1/15	6/12	9/15	13/15	12/15	41/72
is dominated	0/15	0/12	0/15	0/15	1/15	1/72

Reproducibility All experiments were conducted on an in-house server with cloud infrastructure equipped with an Intel(R) Core(TM) i9-10900X CPU @ 3.70GHz, 128 GB of RAM. No GPU acceleration was utilized during these experiments. The code for reproducing our experiments can be found in the following GitHub repository: <https://github.com/AutoFairAthenaRC/GLANCE>.

Running Time In our experiments, **GLOBE-CE** and **dGLOBE-CE** were the fastest methods, typically delivering solutions in seconds, but required up to 30 seconds on datasets with many categorical features due to mandatory one-hot encoding, impacting scalability. **GLANCE** followed, typically completing in under 300 seconds. Other methods were slower, with **Fast AReS** ranging typically between 150–400 seconds, and peaking at 1,400 seconds in some runs. The least computationally efficient were **Group-CF** and **CET**, with maximum runtimes of 3,500 and 17,000 seconds, respectively. **CET** failed to solve the underlying optimization problem after 20 hours of runtime for the Adult dataset across all models.

5.2 Experimental Evaluation

Table 1 presents the summarized results of all competing methods. We compare **GLANCE** against the five other competitors across five datasets and three models, resulting in 75 head-to-head comparisons. However, since **CET** failed to solve the underlying optimization problem for the Adult dataset across all models, the final count is 72 comparisons per **GLANCE** method. Recall that all reported results concern the s -GCE problem for $s = 4$; Appendix H presents an extensive experimental evaluation, including detailed and additional results for $s = 4$ and results for $s = 8$ for all methods.

Pareto Dominance Evaluation We summarize method performance by determining whether one solution dominates another based on effectiveness and cost. Specifically, a solution \mathbb{C} of s -GCE **Pareto dominates** another solution \mathbb{C}' if it offers equal or better effectiveness and cost, and is strictly better in at least one of these objectives.

As shown in Table 2, **GLANCE** dominates other methods in 41 out of 72 cases (57%). It is dominated only once by **dGLOBE-CE** (in HELOC-DNN—cf. Table 1), where the performance of **GLANCE** is competitive in both terms of effectiveness and cost.

Solution Practicality In the prior Pareto-dominance evaluation (Table 2), we compare solutions with optimal or near-optimal effectiveness to many that exhibit insufficient effectiveness. These lower-performing solutions are impractical for GCE, as the goal is to offer recourse to a large population segment. Solutions with low effectiveness fail to meet this goal, limiting their applicability in real-world scenarios. A solution that leaves a significant percentage of individuals without recourse undermines the very purpose of GCE, as noted by Ley et al. [25]. It is also important to note that achieving low recourse costs is easier for smaller subpopulations, especially those near the decision boundary, which explains the low domination scores for **Fast AReS** and **CET**. To address this, we include additional experiments (see Appendix H), where we cap **GLANCE**’s effectiveness, leading to lower costs and dominance over the baselines.

We consider a solution to be practical if it achieves effectiveness of at least 80%. This number could be customizable depending on the dataset and the criticality of the application. Previous papers [25] used smaller thresholds that were too low to be meaningful. In Table 1, impractical solutions are shown in red. **GLANCE** never produces impractical solutions, whereas all **Fast AReS** outputs are impractical, and the remaining methods return 2–5 impractical solutions each.

Robustness We expect methods to be robust, *consistently* generating highly effective and low-cost GCEs across different data splits, which is crucial for real-world deployment. Without robustness, recourse actions can vary significantly, undermining trust and leading to unfair outcomes, especially in critical areas like healthcare or finance. Evaluating the stability of effectiveness and cost metrics across different folds is key to determining the practical applicability of a counterfactual explanation method. Standard deviation measures this stability. An effectiveness deviation above 5% indicates an inconsistency in providing recourse, while a cost deviation exceeding half the average suggests unpredictable actions; since cost scales vary by dataset, uniform robustness thresholds are not always appropriate. These fluctuations make a solution unreliable, and we highlight them in blue in Table 1. **GLANCE** is fully robust in effectiveness (15/15) and nearly so in cost (14/15). Even when excluding low-effectiveness (<80%) solutions, it remains the top performer; the next best methods (dGLOBE-CE, Group-CF) achieve only 11/13 and 10/13. Fig. 4 of the Appendix visualizes Table 1, showing effectiveness vs. cost (scaled 0–1) with standard deviation, illustrating cost-effectiveness trade-offs and method robustness across scenarios.

6 User Study

To better understand how humans evaluate Global Counterfactual Explanations (GCEs), we conducted an online user study following best practices outlined in [25, 9, 35]. The study consisted of two parts and had three primary objectives: (1) to assess how participants weigh trade-offs between effectiveness, average recourse cost, and size; (2) to validate our evaluation metrics, particularly the notions of practicality and robustness, by examining how variance

in cost and effectiveness influences user preferences; and (3) to evaluate how participants rank **GLANCE** relative to baseline methods in both dominated and non-dominated scenarios. We recruited 55 participants—primarily PhD students and ML researchers—from six countries. Full user study details and data analysis are presented in Appendix N; below, we summarize the key findings.

In the first part of the study, participants ranked GCEs produced by three methods: **GLANCE** with $s = 3$, by **GLOBE-CE** with $s = 3$, and by **GLOBE-CE** in its default configuration (resulting in sizes ranging from 58 to 526). Rankings were aggregated using Borda Count [14], resulting in the following order: **GLANCE** | $s = 3 \succ$ **GLOBE-CE** \succ **GLOBE-CE** | $s=3$ with total Borda scores of 473, 277, and 241, respectively. **GLANCE** was significantly preferred over both variations of **GLOBE-CE**. While the default **GLOBE-CE** configuration achieved higher effectiveness and lower cost, participants frequently favored smaller action sets, prioritizing interpretability. These findings suggest that explanation size strongly shapes perceived usefulness, even when effectiveness and cost trade-offs are present.

In the second part of the study, participants made pairwise comparisons between anonymized methods under various trade-off scenarios. **GLANCE** was unanimously preferred over impractical baselines. Notably, **GLANCE** was favored by 74.5% of participants when formally dominated by a competitor, with participants citing its lower variance as the rationale. In non-dominated scenarios, **GLANCE** was preferred in 71.5% of cases on average. These preferences were statistically significant ($p < 0.01$), indicating that robustness, and in particular, lower variance, can outweigh strict numerical dominance in human evaluations.

Participants’ justifications revealed nuanced reasoning: over half prioritized effectiveness overall, but nearly all participants carefully considered trade-offs, including robustness in borderline cases. Several participants noted difficulty in interpreting cost without domain context, underscoring the need for flexible cost metrics. These findings validate our evaluation criteria and highlight the practical value of concise, stable, and interpretable action sets, such as those produced by **GLANCE**.

7 Conclusion

This paper presents **GLANCE**, a flexible framework for generating global counterfactual explanations that optimize the trade-off between effectiveness, cost, and interpretability. Extensive experiments show that **GLANCE** outperforms state-of-the-art methods by producing more effective and cost-efficient counterfactuals, under size constraints. A user study further confirms that the generated explanations are more interpretable, highlighting the practical advantages of our approach.

Acknowledgments and Disclosure of Funding

This work was conducted while Dimitrios Rontogiannis was affiliated with the Athena Research Center and the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens.

This work has been partially supported by the European Union’s Horizon Europe research and innovation programme under Grant Agreements No. 101070568 (AutoFair), No. 101181895 (WiseFood), and No. 101135826 (AI-DAPT) and by the CoDiet project, which is funded by the European Union under Horizon Europe (grant number 101084642) and supported by UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) under the UK government’s Horizon Europe funding guarantee (grant number 101084642).

References

- [1] Julia Angwin, Jeff Larson, Surya Mattu, and Lauren Kirchner. Machine bias. *Ethics of Data and Analytics*, pages 254–264, 5 2016. doi: 10.1201/9781003278290-37.
- [2] Barry Becker and Ronny Kohavi. Adult. UCI Machine Learning Repository, 1996. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24432/C5XW20>.
- [3] Jürgen Branke. *Multiobjective optimization: Interactive and evolutionary approaches*, volume 5252. Springer Science & Business Media, 2008.
- [4] Kyle Brown, Derek Doran, Ryan Kramer, and Brad Reynolds. HELOC applicant risk performance evaluation by topological hierarchical decomposition. *CoRR*, abs/1811.10658, 2018. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1811.10658>.
- [5] Dieter Brughmans, Pieter Leyman, and David Martens. Nice: an algorithm for nearest instance counterfactual explanations. *Data mining and knowledge discovery*, 38(5):2665–2703, 2024.
- [6] Miguel Á Carreira-Perpiñán and Suryabhan Singh Hada. Counterfactual explanations for oblique decision trees: Exact, efficient algorithms. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 35, pages 6903–6911. Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence (AAAI), 2021.
- [7] Emilio Carrizosa, Jasone Ramírez-Ayerbe, and Dolores Romero Morales. Generating collective counterfactual explanations in score-based classification via mathematical optimization. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 238: 121954, 2024.
- [8] Emilio Carrizosa, Jasone Ramírez-Ayerbe, and Dolores Romero Morales. Mathematical optimization modelling for group counterfactual explanations. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 2024.

- [9] Tanya Chowdhury, Razieh Rahimi, and James Allan. Equi-explanation maps: concise and informative global summary explanations. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pages 464–472, 2022.
- [10] Susanne Dandl, Christoph Molnar, Martin Binder, and Bernd Bischl. Multi-objective counterfactual explanations. In *International conference on parallel problem solving from nature*, pages 448–469. Springer, 2020.
- [11] Eoin Delaney, Derek Greene, and Mark T Keane. Instance-based counterfactual explanations for time series classification. In *International conference on case-based reasoning*, pages 32–47. Springer, 2021.
- [12] Dheeru Dua and C Graff. Uci machine learning repository. university of california, school of information and computer science, irvine, ca (2019), 2019.
- [13] U. Feige. A threshold of $\ln n$ for approximating set cover. *Journal of the ACM*, 45(4):634–652, 1998.
- [14] Peter C Fishburn and William V Gehrlein. Borda’s rule, positional voting, and condorcet’s simple majority principle. *Public Choice*, pages 79–88, 1976.
- [15] Christos Fragkathoulas, Vasiliki Papanikou, Evaggelia Pitoura, and Evimaria Terzi. Facegroup: Feasible and actionable counterfactual explanations for group fairness. In *Joint European Conference on Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases*, pages 41–59. Springer, 2025.
- [16] M.R. Garey and D.S. Johnson. *Computers and Intractability: A Guide to the Theory of NP-Completeness*. W. H. Freeman, 1979. ISBN 0-7167-1044-7.
- [17] Riccardo Guidotti. Counterfactual explanations and how to find them: literature review and benchmarking. *Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, 38(5):2770–2824, 2024.
- [18] Zexi Huang, Mert Kosan, Sourav Medya, Sayan Ranu, and Ambuj Singh. Global counterfactual explainer for graph neural networks. In *Proceedings of the Sixteenth ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*, pages 141–149, 2023.
- [19] Kentaro Kanamori, Takuya Takagi, Ken Kobayashi, and Yuichi Ike. Counterfactual explanation trees: Transparent and consistent actionable recourse with decision trees. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1846–1870. PMLR, 2022.
- [20] Amir-Hossein Karimi, Gilles Barthe, Bernhard Schölkopf, and Isabel Valera. A survey of algorithmic recourse: definitions, formulations, solutions, and prospects. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.04050*, 2020.

- [21] Amir-Hossein Karimi, Bernhard Schölkopf, and Isabel Valera. Algorithmic recourse: from counterfactual explanations to interventions. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency*, pages 353–362, 2021.
- [22] Loukas Kavouras, Konstantinos Tsopelas, Giorgos Giannopoulos, Dimitris Sacharidis, Eleni Psaroudaki, Nikolaos Theologitis, Dimitrios Rontogiannis, Dimitris Fotakis, and Ioannis Emiris. Fairness aware counterfactuals for subgroups. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:58246–58276, 2023.
- [23] Jaehoon Koo, Diego Klabjan, and Jean Utke. An inverse classification framework with limited budget and maximum number of perturbed samples. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 212:118761, 2023. ISSN 0957-4174. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2022.118761>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0957417422017791>.
- [24] Dan Ley, Saumitra Mishra, and Daniele Magazzeni. Global counterfactual explanations: Investigations, implementations and improvements. In *ICLR Workshop on Privacy, Accountability, Interpretability, Robustness, Reasoning on Structured Data*, 2022.
- [25] Dan Ley, Saumitra Mishra, and Daniele Magazzeni. GLOBE-CE: A translation based approach for global counterfactual explanations. In Andreas Krause, Emma Brunskill, Kyunghyun Cho, Barbara Engelhardt, Sivan Sabato, and Jonathan Scarlett, editors, *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 202 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 19315–19342. PMLR, 23–29 Jul 2023. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v202/ley23a.html>.
- [26] Tim Miller. Explanation in artificial intelligence: Insights from the social sciences. *Artificial intelligence*, 267:1–38, 2019.
- [27] Ramaravind K Mothilal, Amit Sharma, and Chenhao Tan. Explaining machine learning classifiers through diverse counterfactual explanations. In *Proceedings of the 2020 conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency*, pages 607–617, 2020.
- [28] Kaivalya Rawal and Himabindu Lakkaraju. Beyond individualized recourse: Interpretable and interactive summaries of actionable recourses. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:12187–12198, 2020.
- [29] Shubham Sharma, Jette Henderson, and Joydeep Ghosh. CERTIFAI: counterfactual explanations for robustness, transparency, interpretability, and fairness of artificial intelligence models. *CoRR*, abs/1905.07857, 2019. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1905.07857>.
- [30] Barry Smyth and Mark T Keane. Good counterfactuals and where to find them: A case-based technique for generating counterfactuals for explainable

- ai (xai). *ICCBR 2020: Case-Based Reasoning Research and Development*, 2020.
- [31] Ignacy Stepka, Jerzy Stefanowski, and Mateusz Lango. Counterfactual explanations with probabilistic guarantees on their robustness to model change. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 1277–1288. ACM, 2025. doi: 10.1145/3690624.3709300. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3690624.3709300>.
- [32] Berk Ustun, Alexander Spangher, and Yang Liu. Actionable recourse in linear classification. In *Proceedings of the conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency*, pages 10–19, 2019.
- [33] Sahil Verma, Varich Boonsanong, Minh Hoang, Keegan Hines, John Dickerson, and Chirag Shah. Counterfactual explanations and algorithmic recourses for machine learning: A review. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 56(12): 1–42, 2024.
- [34] Sandra Wachter, Brent Mittelstadt, and Chris Russell. Counterfactual explanations without opening the black box: Automated decisions and the gdpr. *Harv. JL & Tech.*, 31:841, 2017.
- [35] Greta Warren, Mark T Keane, Christophe Gueret, and Eoin Delaney. Explaining groups of instances counterfactually for xai: a use case, algorithm and user study for group-counterfactuals. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.09297*, 2023.
- [36] Ivy Yeh and Che-Hui Lien. The comparisons of data mining techniques for the predictive accuracy of probability of default of credit card clients. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 36:2473–2480, 03 2009. doi: 10.1016/j.eswa.2007.12.020.

Technical Appendix

The appendix is organized as follows:

- Appendix A includes the proof of Theorem 2.
- Appendix B provides a detailed analysis of the inherent trade-offs between solution size, effectiveness, and cost.
- Appendix C presents a time complexity analysis of the **GLANCE** algorithm.
- Appendix D describes the datasets used in our experiments, along with any preprocessing steps applied.
- Appendix E describes the models utilized in our experiments, along with their hyperparameters, and the classification accuracy when trained.
- Appendix F outlines the competing baseline methods, including implementation details and hyperparameters. It also includes results under no size constraints for **GLOBE-CE**.
- Appendix G describes methods used to generate candidate counterfactual actions.
- Appendix H explains the experimental procedure, provides additional summary results for $s = 8$, detailed results for $s = 4$ and $s = 8$, and examines cases where **GLANCE** intentionally sacrifices effectiveness by altering its default action selection method.
- Appendix I presents results for **GLANCE** using different candidate counterfactual generation methods (as described in Appendix G).
- Appendix J reports results using different clustering algorithms in the initial clustering step.
- Appendix K compares the effectiveness and average recourse cost of local counterfactuals per individuals to the GCEs produced by **GLANCE** for $s = 4$.
- Appendix L investigates the effect of varying the number of initial clusters and candidate actions on **GLANCE**'s performance.
- Appendix M discusses potential edge cases that can arise in recourse algorithms.
- Appendix N describes the user study setup, methodology, and full results including statistical analysis.

A Hardness

Proof of Theorem 2. We prove that the decision version of the following special case of s -GCE is NP-complete. The input consists of a model h , a finite set of affected instances $\mathcal{X}_{\text{aff}} = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$, a finite set of allowable actions $\mathbb{A} = \{a_1, \dots, a_m\}$ and a positive fractional number $E \in \mathbb{Q}$. We seek to determine if there is a subset of actions $\mathbb{C} \subseteq \mathbb{A}$ with $\text{size}(\mathbb{C}) \leq s$ and $\text{eff}(\mathbb{C}, \mathcal{X}_{\text{aff}}) \geq E$. We assume that the model h is defined only on $\mathcal{X}_{\text{aff}} \cup \{a_i(x_j) \mid a_i \in \mathbb{A} \text{ and } x_j \in \mathcal{X}_{\text{aff}}\}$ and its full description is given as part of the input.

Membership in NP follows from the fact that for any given \mathbb{C} , we can compute $\text{size}(\mathbb{C})$ and $\text{eff}(\mathbb{C}, \mathcal{X}_{\text{aff}})$ in time polynomial in the size of the input. For the hardness part, we reduce Max s -Cover to the special case of s -GCE above.

In (the decision version of) Max s -Cover, we are given a universe $\mathcal{X} = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ and a family $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, \dots, A_m\}$ of subsets of \mathcal{X} . We want to decide if there is a collection $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ of size at most s so that the union of the subsets in \mathcal{C} equals \mathcal{X} . Max s -Cover is known to be NP-complete [16, SP5]. Feige [13, Theorem 5.3] proved that it is NP-hard to distinguish between yes-instances of Max s -Cover and no-instances where the largest fraction of \mathcal{X} that can be covered by any $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ of size at most s is $1 - 1/e + \epsilon$, for any $\epsilon \in (0, 1/e)$.

Given an instance of Max s -Cover, we construct an instance of s -GCE where the set of affected instances $\mathcal{X}_{\text{aff}} = \mathcal{X}$ and \mathbb{A} consists of n actions, one action a_i for each subset $A_i \in \mathcal{A}$. The model h is a function from $\mathcal{X}_{\text{aff}} \cup \{a_i(x_j) \mid a_i \in \mathbb{A} \text{ and } x_j \in \mathcal{X}_{\text{aff}}\}$ to $\{-1, +1\}$. The counterfactual instances $a_i(x_j)$ can be defined arbitrarily as long as \mathcal{X}_{aff} and the sets $\{a_i(x_j) \mid x_j \in \mathcal{X}_{\text{aff}}\}$ are mutually disjoint. For each $x_j \in \mathcal{X}_{\text{aff}}$, $h(x_j) = -1$. For each action a_i and each $x_j \in \mathcal{X}_{\text{aff}}$, we have that $h(a_i(x_j)) = +1$ if and only if $x_j \in A_i$. We set $E = 1.0$ (due to the inapproximability result of Feige [13, Theorem 5.3], E can be set to any fractional number larger than $1 - 1/e$).

By construction, the effectiveness $\text{eff}(\mathbb{C}, \mathcal{X}_{\text{aff}})$ of any subset of actions $\mathbb{C} \subseteq \mathbb{A}$ under the model h defined above equals the fraction of \mathcal{X} covered by the union of the subsets $A_i \in \mathcal{A}$ that correspond to actions $a_i \in \mathbb{C}$. Therefore, the instance of s -GCE above is a yes-instance if and only if the corresponding instance of Max s -Cover is a yes-instance. Moreover, the construction above along with [13, Theorem 5.3] imply that approximating the optimal effectiveness $\text{eff}(\mathbb{C}, \mathcal{X}_{\text{aff}})$ achievable by the best subset $\mathbb{C} \subseteq \mathbb{A}$ of $\text{size}(\mathbb{C}) \leq s$ in polynomial time within any factor strictly larger than $1 - 1/e$ (even for this very restricted special case of s -CGE) would imply that $\text{P} = \text{NP}$. \square

B Size-Cost and Size-Effectiveness Trade-offs

Let \mathbb{C} denote a set of actions and consider the effect of including a new action a to \mathbb{C} , resulting in $\mathbb{C}' = \mathbb{C} \cup \{a\}$. We analyze how this increase in the solution size (size) impacts the effectiveness (eff) and the average recourse cost (avc).

C1 The new action a does not flip any additional instances.

In this scenario, the effectiveness remains the same, as no new instances

gain recourse. However, the average recourse cost may be affected depending on the cost of the new action relative to those in \mathbb{C} :

- If the cost of a is lower than that of existing actions, it may provide a cheaper alternative for instances already receiving recourse, thereby reducing the average recourse cost.
- If the cost of a is higher, the existing actions will continue to provide recourse to their respective instances, and the average recourse cost will remain unchanged.

C2 The new action a flips previously uncovered instances.

In this scenario, the effectiveness increases due to additional instances receiving recourse. The impact on average recourse cost again depends on the cost of the new action:

- If the cost of a is less than the current average recourse cost, it introduces lower-cost recourse for additional instances, thereby reducing the overall average recourse cost.
- If the cost of a is greater than the current average recourse cost, it increases the total cost, leading to a higher average recourse cost.

This analysis highlights the inherent trade-offs between size, effectiveness, and cost, emphasizing the importance of carefully selecting new actions to achieve a desirable balance. Notably, achieving near-optimal effectiveness (close to 100%) often requires the inclusion of costly actions that address outliers. Nonetheless, our method demonstrates the ability to achieve near-optimal effectiveness with relatively low average recourse costs across a broad range of datasets.

C Time Complexity Analysis

Let n be the number of instances, k the initial number of clusters, s the number of global counterfactual actions, m the number of candidate actions to generate, and d the number of features. Let $\mathcal{T}_{CF}(d, \text{model})$ be the time of generating a single candidate counterfactual action and $\mathcal{T}_{\text{model}}$ be the prediction time of the black-box model. Let's assume that k -means is used for the clustering and I is the number of iterations required for convergence. Then **GLANCE** time complexity is:

- **Clustering (K-means):** $\mathcal{O}(nkdI)$
- **Action Generation:** $\mathcal{O}(k \cdot m \cdot \mathcal{T}_{CF}(d, \text{model}))$
- **Merging Clusters:** $\mathcal{O}((k - s)k^2d)$
 - **Finding pair of closest clusters:**
 - * For one iteration: $\mathcal{O}(k^2d)$
 - * For all iterations: $\mathcal{O}((k - s)k^2d)$

– **Merging pair of closest clusters:**

* For one iteration: $\mathcal{O}(d + d)$

* For all iterations: $\mathcal{O}((k - s)d)$

• **Evaluation and selection of final actions:** $\mathcal{O}(mkn\mathcal{T}_{\text{model}})$

After simplifying common terms, the total complexity is:

$$\mathcal{O}(nkdI + km\mathcal{T}_{\text{CF}}(d, \text{model}) + d(k - s)k^2 + nkm\mathcal{T}_{\text{model}})$$

D Datasets & Preprocessing

Table 3: Summary of the datasets used in our experiments. Specifically, we list the number of instances (No.Inst), input dimensions (i.e., the number of continuous features plus the number of categorical after the one-hot-encoding preprocessing step performed internally by the models), the number of categorical and continuous features, and the number of instances used for training and testing, evaluated using a 5-fold cross-validation strategy.

Dataset	No. Instances	Input Dim.	Categorical	Continuous	Train	Test
Adult	30161	102	8	5	24128	6033
COMPAS	6172	15	4	2	4937	1235
Default Credit	30000	91	9	14	24000	6000
German Credit	1000	71	17	3	800	200
HELOC	9871	23	0	23	7896	1975

We use five publicly available datasets as benchmarks. Our choice is based on their established use in previous works. Table 3 summarizes the datasets’ information, including the number of instances, the number of categorical and continuous features, the input dimensions (i.e., the number of continuous features plus the number of categorical after a preprocessing step using one-hot-encoding), and the number of instances used for training and testing, evaluated using a 5-fold cross-validation strategy. This approach illustrates the resilience of our method across various splits.

The dataset preprocessing follows the approach in Ley et al. [25], using the publicly available repository at <https://github.com/danwley/GLOBE-CE/>. For completeness, we also provide a short description of each dataset below.

Adult The Adult dataset (also known as “Census Income” dataset) is designed for the task of predicting whether an individual’s income exceeds \$ 50K/yr, based on census data. The data as well as more detailed information can be obtained at <https://archive.ics.uci.edu/dataset/2/adult>.

For the preprocessing of this dataset, we first drop the “education-num” feature due to redundancy with the “education” feature (which takes on string values). Next, we remove missing values and map the class labels ‘<=50K’

and ‘>50K’ to 0 and 1, respectively. Additional minor transformations, mostly involving data types, are applied and can be reviewed in our source code.

COMPAS The COMPAS dataset (Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions) [1] is available at: <https://github.com/propublica/compas-analysis/blob/master/compas-scores-two-years.csv>. Detailed description and information on the dataset can be found at <https://www.propublica.org/article/how-we-analyzed-the-compas-recidivism-algorithm>. It categorizes recidivism risk based on several factors, including race.

For the preprocessing of this dataset, we have to drop the feature “days_b_screening_arrest”, as it contains missing values. We also turn jail-in and jail-out dates to durations and turn negative durations to 0. Some additional filters are taken from the COMPAS analysis by ProPublica: <https://github.com/propublica/compas-analysis>. Finally, the target variable’s values are transformed into the canonical 0 for the negative class and 1 for the positive class.

Default Credit The Default Credit dataset [36] is designed to classify the risk of default on customer payments, aiming to support the development and assessment of models for predicting creditworthiness and the likelihood of loan default. It can be obtained at <https://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml/datasets/default+of+credit+card+clients>.

To properly work with this dataset, we needed to drop the “ID” feature, since it holds no useful information, and transform the target labels into the canonical 0 - 1 values.

German Credit The German Credit dataset [12] classifies people described by a set of attributes as good or bad credit risks. A detailed description and the dataset can be found in [https://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml/datasets/statlog+\(german+credit+data\)](https://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml/datasets/statlog+(german+credit+data)).

The only preprocessing step we performed for this dataset was the transformation of the target variable’s values into 0 - 1.

HELOC The HELOC (Home Equity Line of Credit) dataset [4] contains anonymized information about home equity line of credit applications made by real homeowners, classifying credit risk. It is available at <https://community.fico.com/s/explainable-machine-learning-challenge>. All the features on this dataset are numeric.

A substantial percentage of these features’ values are missing, so the main preprocessing step we performed here was to remove rows where all values are missing, and then replace all remaining missing values with the median of the respective feature. Other than that, we only needed to transform target labels to 0-1.

E Models and Hyperparameters

In our experimental evaluation, we utilize three distinct models: XGBoost (XGB), Logistic Regression (LR), and Deep Neural Networks (DNNs). Following Ley et al. [25], we maintain an 80:20 train-test split, but, instead of splitting once, we perform 5-fold cross-validation, using each fold as a test set while training on the remaining four. The distinctive hyperparameters for each model are described in detail in this section. Additionally, we showcase the performance metric (accuracy), with all reported accuracies presented as the mean and standard deviation across the folds, providing a standardized foundation for comparative analysis of our methodologies.

XGBoost (XGB) Implementation from the `xgboost`¹ library. Hyperparameter values for each dataset and the model’s accuracy on the test set are shown in Table 4.

Table 4: XGBoost Hyperparameter Configurations.

Dataset	Depth	Estimators	γ, α, λ	Test Accuracy
Adult	6	100	0,0,1	86.62% \pm 0.18%
COMPAS	4	100	1,0,1	67.95% \pm 1.73%
Default Credit	10	200	2,4,1	81.35% \pm 0.18%
German Credit	6	500	0,0,1	76.9% \pm 0.86%
HELOC	6	100	4,4,1	72.97% \pm 1.14%

Logistic Regression (LR) Implementation from `sklearn`² library. Hyperparameter values for each dataset and the model’s accuracy on the test set are shown in Table 5.

Table 5: Logistic Regression Hyperparameter Configurations.

Dataset	Max Iter.	Class Weights(0:1)	Test Accuracy
Adult	100	1:1	79.09% \pm 0.12%
COMPAS	1000	1:1	66.69% \pm 0.97%
Default Credit	1000	1:1	82.08% \pm 0.19%
German Credit	1000	1:1	74.80% \pm 1.91%
HELOC	3000	1:1	73.06% \pm 0.96%

¹<https://xgboost.readthedocs.io/en/stable/>

²https://scikit-learn.org/stable/modules/generated/sklearn.linear_model.LogisticRegression.html

Deep Neural Network (DNN) Implementation using `pytorch`³ library. Hyperparameter values for each dataset and the model’s accuracy on the test set are shown in Table 6.

Table 6: Deep Neural Network Hyperparameter Configurations.

Dataset	Hidden Layers Width	Test Accuracy
Adult	[64, 32, 16]	84.13% \pm 0.30%
COMPAS	[64, 32, 16]	66.98% \pm 1.27%
Default Credit	[64, 32, 16, 8]	81.37% \pm 0.13%
German Credit	[8, 4]	71.3% \pm 2.27%
HELOC	[64, 32, 16, 8]	70.97% \pm 0.54%

F Competing Methods

ARes The **ARes** method, first introduced by Rawal and Lakkaraju [28], was executed using the enhanced **Fast ARes** version implemented by [25]. The code for this version was obtained from the following GitHub repository: <https://github.com/danwley/GLOBE-CE>. We used the default hyperparameters provided in this implementation.

CET The **CET** method, introduced by Kanamori et al. [19], was executed using the original implementation that was available on the following GitHub repository: <https://github.com/kelicht/cet>. We had to replace the solver they used for the MIP solved at each node of their tree. The IBM CPLEX solver is proprietary, and we replaced it with the GUROBI solver, for which we had an available license. We used the default hyperparameters provided in this implementation.

GroupCF The **GroupCF** method, introduced by Warren et al. [35], was implemented using custom code due to some ambiguity in the instructions provided in the original GitHub repository (https://github.com/e-delaney/group_cfe), which made the original implementation challenging to follow.

GLOBE-CE The **GLOBE-CE** method, introduced by Ley et al. [25], was executed based on the implementation available on the following GitHub repository: <https://github.com/danwley/GLOBE-CE>.

Additional results of **GLOBE-CE** can be found in Table 7. Here, we do not constrain the set of actions, and we observe better performance, especially in terms of cost. However, these solutions do not represent solutions for *s*-GCE

³<https://pytorch.org/docs/stable/index.html>

Table 7: GLOBE-CE results across datasets and models without the action set size constraints.

Model	Dataset	eff	avc	size
DNN	Adult	100.0 \pm 0.0	1.24 \pm 0.06	322.4
	COMPAS	100.0 \pm 0.0	1.11 \pm 0.6	186.2
	Default Credit	98.9 \pm 0.73	1.1 \pm 0.04	18.4
	German Credit	95.69 \pm 2.42	1.12 \pm 0.09	4.2
	HELOC	84.32 \pm 19.32	2.63 \pm 1.03	224.8
LR	Adult	100.0 \pm 0.0	1.2 \pm 0.03	545.2
	COMPAS	98.92 \pm 8.52	1.41 \pm 0.19	97.8
	Default Credit	99.94 \pm 0.07	1.08 \pm 0.01	4.6
	German Credit	71.29 \pm 14.27	1.05 \pm 0.09	1.5
	HELOC	100.0 \pm 0.0	0.44 \pm 0.06	512.8
XGB	Adult	93.76 \pm 0.91	4.28 \pm 4.46	46.8
	COMPAS	92.34 \pm 8.87	1.22 \pm 0.27	42.6
	Default Credit	94.62 \pm 2.85	1.05 \pm 0.28	40.6
	German Credit	84.97 \pm 10.46	1.17 \pm 0.15	2.2
	HELOC	30.32 \pm 4.07	2.11 \pm 0.47	17

problem, since the solution size can be up to an average of 545.2 actions using 5-fold cross-validation (in Adult-LR case).

dGLOBE-CE The dGLOBE-CE method, introduced by Ley et al. [25], was executed using the implementation available on their GitHub repository (<https://github.com/danwley/GLOBE-CE>).

G Candidate Counterfactual Action Generators

In this section, we outline the methods used to generate candidate counterfactual explanations and present comparative results employing different generation methods. To demonstrate the modularity of our framework, we developed and utilized various methods, showing that our approach is not tied to a specific counterfactual generation technique. The comparative results of these experiments are shown in Table 16. For the results presented in Table 1 of the main paper and Table 9, DiCE [27] was used to generate candidate counterfactuals.

DiCE Detailed information on its methodology can be found in the corresponding paper by Mothilal et al. [27], and we encourage interested readers to refer to it for a deeper understanding.

For the scope of this paper, it suffices to say that DiCE offers a number of alternative algorithms for finding local counterfactuals. In our experiments,

we use the ‘random’ algorithm, which selects features to change at random and tests whether the change results in a successful counterfactual.

The other algorithms were either unsuitable for a black-box setting (e.g., requiring gradients), computationally inefficient (e.g., genetic algorithm), or failed to generate cost-efficient counterfactuals (e.g., KDTree) during our initial experimentation.

Random Sampling We developed a method called ‘Random Sampling’. To find counterfactuals for an affected instance, this method iteratively modifies its features one at a time. The process begins by randomly altering one feature at a time, generating multiple new candidate instances. Each modified instance is then evaluated by querying the black-box model to determine whether it qualifies as a valid counterfactual. The method proceeds to modify additional features, building a set of potential counterfactuals.

Key differences between our method and DiCE’s random approach include:

1. We focus on modifying only the top k_f most important features (using permutation feature importance), set to 3 in all experiments.
2. For categorical features, only the top k_c most frequent categories among unaffected individuals are considered replacement candidates (set to 10 for all experiments).
3. We also introduce vectorization in certain operations, improving computational efficiency over DiCE’s implementation.

Nearest Neighbors This method is implemented by storing all unaffected individuals in memory. When queried to provide k counterfactuals for an affected individual, it retrieves the k nearest neighbors from the set of unaffected instances based on their proximity to the affected individual. This approach ensures that the generated counterfactuals are valid and closely aligned with the original instance, improving the relevance of the recommendations.

Nearest Neighbors Scaled This algorithm closely resembles the ‘Nearest Neighbors’ one but introduces a key enhancement. Rather than returning the k nearest neighbors, it performs a localized search along the multidimensional line connecting the affected individual and any neighbor. We sample points along this line segment, and if any are classified as positive by the model, they are returned instead, as they are closer to the affected instance, potentially offering a more cost-efficient recourse.

H Experimental Results

H.1 Experimental Procedure

We evaluate our algorithms by comparing them with the following methods: **Fast AReS** by Ley et al. [24], **CET** by Kanamori et al. [19], **GroupCF** by Warren

et al. [35], GLOBE-CE, and dGLOBE-CE by Ley et al. [25]. For the competing methods, we used the default hyperparameters as found in their respective GitHub repositories, referenced in Appendix F.

For GLANCE, we used the following default hyperparameters: 100 initial clusters for all datasets (30 for German Credit), 10 candidate local counterfactuals were generated per cluster, k -means as the clustering method, DiCE as the candidate action generation method. To ensure reproducibility, we fixed the random seed to 13 for both the clustering process and local counterfactual generation.

All of the methods are constrained to solve s -GCE problem, with $s = 4$ and $s = 8$. These constraints are applied differently depending on the method. In GLANCE and GroupCF, we configure the resulting number of clusters to match the target sizes. GLOBE-CE is constrained by a maximum of 5 or 9 scalars, while dGLOBE-CE is limited to 4 or 8 directions, with up to two scalars per direction. Lastly, CET is constrained with a maximum of 4 or 8 leaves.




Figure 4: Comparison of effectiveness (eff) and average recourse cost (avc), normalized with the maximum cost achieved in each dataset/model combination) for the solution of s -GCE with $s = 4$. Standard deviations are represented by error bars. The red horizontal lines represent the $\text{eff} > 80\%$ threshold for evaluating the practicality of the solutions.

H.2 Summary of Experiments

In Table 1 of the main paper, we present summarized results for $s = 4$, which are visualized in Figure 4. Complementary results for $s = 8$ can be found in Table 9 of the following section. The summarized results include the effectiveness and cost of each solution for all the datasets and model combinations. In Tables 11-15, we provide detailed results for each model, adding runtime and the number of actions per dataset and method alongside effectiveness and cost.

H.3 Experiments for Effectiveness-Cost Trade-offs

As shown in the main paper Table 1, our methods significantly outperform CET and Fast AReS in terms of effectiveness. Fast AReS fails to exceed 80% effectiveness in any case, and CET achieves near-optimal effectiveness in less than half the cases, sometimes failing to find a solution altogether. These low effectiveness levels make fair comparisons challenging, as solving for a small subset of the population is inherently easier.

To address this challenge, we demonstrate in Table 8 that by intentionally lowering our solutions’ effectiveness and selecting cost-efficient actions, our approach can still dominate other methods, achieving both greater effectiveness and lower cost. This adaptability underscores the strength of our methodology in maintaining superior performance even when optimizing for different trade-offs.

Our algorithm’s default strategy selects optimal solutions based on maximum effectiveness. However, it also supports alternative strategies, such as selecting the lowest-cost solution, the lowest-cost solution above a specified effectiveness threshold, or the most effective solution below a specified cost. For the experiments presented Table 8, we used the “lowest cost above a certain effectiveness threshold” strategy in GLANCE, setting thresholds based on the effectiveness levels achieved by other methods. This flexibility highlights the algorithm’s ability to align with various evaluation scenarios and user-defined trade-offs.

H.4 Results for $s = 8$

Table 9 presents the comparison of our method, GLANCE, with other state-of-the-art methods (Fast AReS, CET, Group-CF, GLOBE-CE, and dGLOBE-CE) for a maximum of 8 actions. The results indicate that GLANCE demonstrates superior performance in most cases, achieving nearly 100% effectiveness with minimal and stable costs across all datasets and models. Exceptions are noted in the HELOC DNN and XGB experiments, where all methods report higher costs due to the dataset’s numeric-only features. In contrast, Fast AReS struggles significantly, particularly on the Adult dataset, showing effectiveness as low as 13.8% for DNN, 12.51% for LR, and 7.19% for XGB, explaining its lower costs. Other methods, such as GroupCF, CET, GLOBE-CE, and dGLOBE-CE, generally perform well in terms of effectiveness but in almost all cases incur higher costs compared to GLANCE.

We repeat the experimental evaluation utilizing Pareto-dominance for $s = 8$. As shown in Table 10 GLANCE dominates other methods in 38 out of 72 cases (53%) while it is dominated once by dGLOBE-CE (in Heloc-DNN).

H.5 Detailed results

Table 11 presents a comparative analysis of all algorithms for the Adult dataset. The Fast AReS method consistently performs poorly, achieving notably low

Table 8: Experimental results comparing **GLANCE** to baseline methods under constrained effectiveness. To enable fair comparison with less effective baselines, **GLANCE**'s effectiveness is intentionally reduced via thresholding, allowing the identification of cost-efficient dominating solutions in the low-effectiveness regime. We report the effectiveness (**eff**) and average recourse cost (**avc**), and standard deviation for all methods.

Dataset	Models	Competitors	Competitors Results		GLANCE Results	
			eff	avc	eff	avc
Adult	DNN	Fast AReS	12.39 ± 1.06	1.0 ± 0.0	26.59 ± 10.5	0.66 ± 0.23
		CET	NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN
		GroupCF	100.0 ± 0.0	10.08 ± 0.03	100.0 ± 0.0	1.73 ± 0.06
		GLOBE-CE	99.92 ± 0.0	3.34 ± 0.29	99.96 ± 0.01	1.71 ± 0.05
		dGLOBE-CE	99.92 ± 0.0	10.89 ± 1.37	99.96 ± 0.01	1.71 ± 0.05
	LR	Fast AReS	11.74 ± 2.4	1.0 ± 0.0	57.91 ± 24.77	0.63 ± 0.26
		CET	NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN
		GroupCF	100.0 ± 0.0	1.71 ± 0.39	100.0 ± 0.0	0.78 ± 0.06
		GLOBE-CE	99.92 ± 0.0	2.34 ± 0.31	99.96 ± 0.02	0.78 ± 0.06
		dGLOBE-CE	99.92 ± 0.0	5.91 ± 0.93	99.96 ± 0.02	0.78 ± 0.06
	XGB	Fast AReS	6.13 ± 0.42	1.0 ± 0.0	31.16 ± 8.02	0.66 ± 0.13
		CET	NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN
GroupCF		96.8 ± 1.72	1.41 ± 0.54	97.16 ± 0.41	0.81 ± 0.02	
GLOBE-CE		82.88 ± 12.13	30.1 ± 10.39	94.04 ± 0.46	0.77 ± 0.01	
dGLOBE-CE		93.76 ± 1.98	64.76 ± 1.29	94.04 ± 0.46	0.77 ± 0.01	
Default Credit	DNN	Fast AReS	18.88 ± 2.16	1.0 ± 0.0	21.54 ± 4.11	0.3 ± 0.1
		CET	98.87 ± 0.62	6.32 ± 2.28	99.83 ± 0.1	0.82 ± 0.04
		GroupCF	79.6 ± 20.79	1.53 ± 0.62	81.44 ± 2.18	0.8 ± 0.08
		GLOBE-CE	81.19 ± 35.33	3.76 ± 1.35	81.44 ± 2.18	0.8 ± 0.08
		dGLOBE-CE	87.38 ± 18.69	5.96 ± 4.14	91.22 ± 3.87	0.81 ± 0.07
	LR	Fast AReS	10.85 ± 5.45	1.07 ± 0.13	65.14 ± 15.62	0.55 ± 0.11
		CET	100.0 ± 0.0	3.79 ± 1.31	100.0 ± 0.0	0.73 ± 0.07
		GroupCF	95.4 ± 9.2	1.94 ± 1.2	99.05 ± 0.38	0.71 ± 0.07
		GLOBE-CE	99.94 ± 0.07	2.91 ± 1.55	100.0 ± 0.0	0.73 ± 0.07
		dGLOBE-CE	99.94 ± 0.07	10.38 ± 7.76	100.0 ± 0.0	0.73 ± 0.07
	XGB	Fast AReS	31.86 ± 5.12	1.05 ± 0.04	40.03 ± 7.82	0.13 ± 0.04
		CET	86.29 ± 9.94	4.5 ± 2.64	89.31 ± 2.77	0.73 ± 0.06
GroupCF		95.2 ± 1.6	1.41 ± 0.64	95.73 ± 0.18	1.01 ± 0.05	
GLOBE-CE		83.69 ± 6.72	17.21 ± 2.22	83.77 ± 0.84	0.63 ± 0.08	
dGLOBE-CE		97.47 ± 0.82	42.58 ± 3.57	97.64 ± 0.12	1.37 ± 0.25	
HELOC	DNN	Fast AReS	12.19 ± 0.58	1.03 ± 0.05	21.32 ± 5.13	0.11 ± 0.11
		CET	86.78 ± 10.62	8.67 ± 3.25	92.67 ± 4.69	3.52 ± 1.09
		GroupCF	80.4 ± 10.17	3.09 ± 0.91	82.31 ± 1.81	3.09 ± 0.9
		GLOBE-CE	47.18 ± 45.02	20.44 ± 24.18	45.49 ± 2.1	1.19 ± 0.71
		dGLOBE-CE	99.96 ± 0.05	11.07 ± 8.6	100.0 ± 0.0	4.22 ± 1.10
	LR	Fast AReS	9.23 ± 1.24	1.12 ± 0.1	71.55 ± 3.72	0.43 ± 0.04
		CET	100.0 ± 0.0	3.57 ± 1.48	100.0 ± 0.0	0.72 ± 0.11
		GroupCF	90.6 ± 3.93	2.4 ± 1.38	95.18 ± 1.75	0.6 ± 0.08
		GLOBE-CE	99.9 ± 0.0	0.66 ± 0.1	99.92 ± 0.04	0.7 ± 0.11
		dGLOBE-CE	99.9 ± 0.0	1.63 ± 0.35	99.92 ± 0.04	0.7 ± 0.11
	XGB	Fast AReS	8.49 ± 1.32	1.16 ± 0.13	9.66 ± 1.12	0.4 ± 0.05
		CET	86.78 ± 6.7	12.51 ± 2.75	90.72 ± 3.35	11.53 ± 2.94
GroupCF		78.4 ± 5.82	5.63 ± 1.93	82.46 ± 6.55	8.45 ± 3.1	
GLOBE-CE		28.33 ± 5.14	32.73 ± 0.48	28.64 ± 0.99	0.85 ± 0.19	
dGLOBE-CE		77.64 ± 11.51	128.0 ± 0.0	82.46 ± 6.55	8.45 ± 3.1	

Table 9: Evaluating the effectiveness (eff) and average recourse cost (avc) of GLANCE against Fast AReS, CET, Group-CF, GLOBE-CE, and dGLOBE-CE GCE methods for the s -GCE problem with $s = 8$. s -GCE solutions with effectiveness below 80% are highlighted in red. Non-robust GCEs, i.e., std in effectiveness greater than 5% across folds or a std in cost greater than half the average recourse cost, are highlighted in blue.

Dataset	Method	DNN		LR		XGB	
		eff	avc	eff	avc	eff	avc
Adult	Fast AReS	13.8 ± 0.92	1.0 ± 0.0	12.51 ± 2.44	1.0 ± 0.0	7.19 ± 0.3	1.0 ± 0.0
	CET	nan ± nan	nan ± nan	nan ± nan	nan ± nan	nan ± nan	nan ± nan
	Group-CF	100.0 ± 0.0	11.54 ± 2.98	100.0 ± 0.0	2.33 ± 1.91	99.4 ± 1.2	1.88 ± 1.36
	GLOBE-CE	99.92 ± 0.0	2.4 ± 0.12	99.92 ± 0.0	1.66 ± 0.9	86.33 ± 8.81	11.7 ± 3.91
	dGLOBE-CE	100.0 ± 0.0	11.85 ± 1.53	100.0 ± 0.0	6.12 ± 0.64	94.38 ± 2.01	62.37 ± 3.07
	GLANCE	100.0 ± 0.0	3.96 ± 0.56	100.0 ± 0.0	1.03 ± 0.07	99.87 ± 0.09	3.85 ± 2.33
COMPAS	Fast AReS	63.02 ± 1.58	1.11 ± 0.04	68.19 ± 0.6	1.03 ± 0.01	66.07 ± 2.5	1.14 ± 0.1
	CET	74.66 ± 5.33	1.02 ± 0.07	82.51 ± 2.97	1.51 ± 0.23	68.62 ± 15.67	1.3 ± 0.52
	Group-CF	100.0 ± 0.0	5.65 ± 3.14	100.0 ± 0.0	4.67 ± 2.29	100.0 ± 0.0	4.08 ± 2.15
	GLOBE-CE	100.0 ± 0.0	2.39 ± 0.87	95.74 ± 8.52	2.25 ± 0.24	87.21 ± 11.04	3.09 ± 0.47
	dGLOBE-CE	100.0 ± 0.0	7.28 ± 1.25	100.0 ± 0.0	6.71 ± 0.23	99.96 ± 0.08	9.17 ± 2.01
	GLANCE	100.0 ± 0.0	1.77 ± 0.16	100.0 ± 0.0	1.69 ± 0.06	99.83 ± 0.24	2.06 ± 0.46
Default Credit	Fast AReS	23.75 ± 1.81	1.02 ± 0.03	11.67 ± 6.18	1.04 ± 0.08	36.88 ± 5.46	1.07 ± 0.06
	CET	98.53 ± 2.11	3.68 ± 1.46	100.0 ± 0.0	2.0 ± 1.36	90.01 ± 10.44	2.61 ± 1.06
	Group-CF	84.8 ± 13.23	2.15 ± 0.98	100.0 ± 0.0	3.98 ± 2.86	97.8 ± 0.75	1.92 ± 1.33
	GLOBE-CE	95.9 ± 5.71	2.58 ± 0.78	99.94 ± 0.07	2.13 ± 0.89	85.63 ± 6.0	9.78 ± 1.0
	dGLOBE-CE	99.95 ± 0.04	6.77 ± 3.67	99.94 ± 0.07	10.38 ± 7.76	99.08 ± 0.66	28.73 ± 9.8
	GLANCE	100.0 ± 0.0	1.2 ± 0.4	100.0 ± 0.0	1.05 ± 0.11	98.87 ± 0.59	2.14 ± 0.18
German Credit	Fast AReS	65.47 ± 2.2	1.0 ± 0.0	71.9 ± 2.65	1.0 ± 0.0	68.88 ± 1.27	1.0 ± 0.0
	CET	100.0 ± 0.0	1.27 ± 0.37	98.75 ± 1.67	2.02 ± 0.33	100.0 ± 0.0	2.18 ± 0.37
	Group-CF	99.6 ± 0.8	2.49 ± 0.82	98.9 ± 1.65	10.56 ± 2.43	100.0 ± 0.0	4.05 ± 2.55
	GLOBE-CE	95.55 ± 2.39	1.88 ± 0.36	57.55 ± 19.97	2.25 ± 0.33	77.05 ± 11.26	2.49 ± 0.34
	dGLOBE-CE	98.09 ± 1.72	2.34 ± 0.17	69.89 ± 15.35	2.47 ± 0.23	88.17 ± 8.2	2.64 ± 0.78
	GLANCE	96.43 ± 3.6	0.86 ± 0.18	100.0 ± 0.0	1.18 ± 0.05	100.0 ± 0.0	1.02 ± 0.04
HELOC	Fast AReS	15.44 ± 1.91	1.05 ± 0.06	10.95 ± 1.73	1.11 ± 0.07	11.22 ± 2.05	1.09 ± 0.09
	CET	99.36 ± 0.92	8.86 ± 2.99	100.0 ± 0.0	2.99 ± 1.3	90.25 ± 2.51	12.99 ± 3.49
	Group-CF	84.8 ± 12.32	1.98 ± 0.5	96.6 ± 1.96	1.98 ± 0.5	81.4 ± 4.22	5.14 ± 1.46
	GLOBE-CE	29.02 ± 39.47	7.88 ± 7.19	99.9 ± 0.0	0.55 ± 0.08	29.18 ± 4.54	16.41 ± 0.3
	dGLOBE-CE	100.0 ± 0.0	6.65 ± 0.15	99.9 ± 0.0	1.63 ± 0.35	81.95 ± 10.38	128.0 ± 0.0
	GLANCE	99.98 ± 0.04	9.42 ± 2.22	100.0 ± 0.0	1.2 ± 0.12	99.0 ± 0.55	16.65 ± 2.44

Table 10: Pareto domination evaluation of solutions, for s -GCE problem with $s = 8$. The table reports the rate (number of times over available comparisons) at which GLANCE method dominates and is dominated by competitor methods.

GLANCE	Fast AReS	CET	GroupCF	GLOBE-CE	dGLOBE-CE	\sum_{overall}
dominates	1/15	6/12	9/15	11/15	11/15	38/72
is dominated	0/15	0/12	0/15	0/15	1/15	1/72

effectiveness scores across all models.

It is also noteworthy that in the Adult dataset, which is the largest of all in terms of instances and dimensions, the CET method did not run properly due to exceedingly high runtimes or infeasibility determined by the Gurobi optimizer.




Figure 5: Comparison of effectiveness (eff) and average recourse cost (avc), normalized with the maximum cost achieved in each dataset/model combination for the solution of s -GCE with $s = 8$. Standard deviations are represented by error bars. The red horizontal lines represent the $\text{eff} > 80\%$ threshold for evaluating the practicality of the solution.

Table 11: Detailed results for the solution of s -GCE ($s = 4$ and $s = 8$) for Adult dataset. The table reports effectiveness (eff), cost (avc), size (size), and runtime, including their standard deviations for each method.

Model	Method	$s = 4$				$s = 8$			
		eff	avc	size	RunTime	eff	avc	size	RunTime
DNN	Fast AReS	12.39 ± 1.06	1.0 ± 0.0	4.0	266.51 ± 127.13	13.8 ± 0.92	1.0 ± 0.0	8.0	271.04 ± 126.28
	CET	-	-	-	>20h or infeasible	-	-	-	>20h or infeasible
	GroupCF	100.0 ± 0.0	10.08 ± 0.03	4.0	3224.75 ± 0.03	100.0 ± 0.0	11.54 ± 2.98	8.0	3539.35 ± 2.98
	GLOBE-CE	99.92 ± 0.0	3.34 ± 0.29	3.8	6.6 ± 0.22	99.92 ± 0.0	2.4 ± 0.12	7.0	6.56 ± 0.18
	dGLOBE-CE	99.92 ± 0.0	10.89 ± 1.37	3.6	9.74 ± 0.21	100.0 ± 0.0	11.85 ± 1.53	6.4	14.09 ± 0.4
	GLANCE	100.0 ± 0.0	4.6 ± 0.73	4.0	246.82 ± 0.0	100.0 ± 0.0	3.96 ± 0.56	8.0	240.16 ± 0.0
LR	Fast AReS	11.74 ± 2.4	1.0 ± 0.0	4.0	124.2 ± 57.64	12.51 ± 2.44	1.0 ± 0.0	8.0	157.94 ± 73.44
	CET	-	-	-	>20h or infeasible	-	-	-	>20h or infeasible
	GroupCF	100.0 ± 0.0	1.71 ± 0.39	4.0	925.25 ± 0.39	100.0 ± 0.0	2.33 ± 1.91	8.0	872.1 ± 1.91
	GLOBE-CE	99.92 ± 0.0	2.34 ± 0.31	4.0	6.48 ± 0.17	99.92 ± 0.0	1.66 ± 0.09	7.8	6.41 ± 0.08
	dGLOBE-CE	99.92 ± 0.0	5.91 ± 0.93	4.0	9.36 ± 0.06	100.0 ± 0.0	6.12 ± 0.64	8.0	13.57 ± 0.22
	GLANCE	100.0 ± 0.0	1.04 ± 0.07	4.0	194.83 ± 0.0	100.0 ± 0.0	1.03 ± 0.07	8.0	179.43 ± 0.0
XGB	Fast AReS	6.13 ± 0.42	1.0 ± 0.0	4.0	108.66 ± 57.21	7.19 ± 0.3	1.0 ± 0.0	8.0	142.82 ± 67.84
	CET	-	-	-	>20h or infeasible	-	-	-	>20h or infeasible
	GroupCF	96.8 ± 1.72	1.41 ± 0.54	4.0	596.57 ± 0.54	99.4 ± 1.2	1.88 ± 1.36	8.0	1705.8 ± 1.36
	GLOBE-CE	82.88 ± 12.13	22.8 ± 7.87	3	5.44 ± 0.18	86.33 ± 8.81	11.7 ± 3.91	3.6	5.58 ± 0.11
	dGLOBE-CE	93.76 ± 1.98	64.76 ± 1.29	4.0	8.26 ± 0.14	94.38 ± 2.01	62.37 ± 3.07	7.4	12.01 ± 0.33
	GLANCE	99.85 ± 0.12	5.98 ± 4.22	4.0	134.27 ± 0.0	99.87 ± 0.09	3.85 ± 2.33	8.0	126.65 ± 0.0

This is indicated by the “>20h or Infeasible (on Gurobi)” note present in the runtime column for CET (both $s = 4$ and $s = 8$) across all models.

On the other hand, GroupCF, GLANCE, and GLOBE-CE methods all perform notably well in terms of effectiveness. Under the DNN model GLANCE-4 and

GLANCE-8 achieve perfect effectiveness scores of 100% with similarly good cost performance. Notably, GLOBE-CE-8 achieves the best cost performance under the DNN model with an effectiveness score of 100% and a cost of 2.4.

In the LR model, GLANCE achieves 100% effectiveness with costs of 1.04 and 1.03. Similarly, in the XGB model, GLANCE-4, and GLANCE-8 maintain high effectiveness scores of 99.85%, and 99.87%, with really good respective costs.

Table 12: Detailed results for the solution of s -GCE ($s = 4$ and $s = 8$) for COMPAS dataset. The table reports effectiveness (eff), cost (avc), size (size), and runtime, including their standard deviations for each method.

Model	Method	$s = 4$				$s = 8$			
		eff	avc	size	Runtime	eff	avc	size	Runtime
DNN	Fast AReS	55.0 ± 0.86	1.21 ± 0.09	4	59.26 ± 26.71	63.02 ± 1.58	1.11 ± 0.04	8	65.84 ± 29.93
	CET	63.62 ± 10.35	0.96 ± 0.24	7.0	1339.42 ± 247.04	74.66 ± 5.33	1.02 ± 0.07	8.0	656.64 ± 119.51
	GroupCF	100.0 ± 0.0	4.48 ± 2.53	4	173.24 ± 2.53	100.0 ± 0.0	5.65 ± 3.14	8	210.34 ± 3.68
	GLOBE-CE	100.0 ± 0.0	2.82 ± 1.06	4.0	1.09 ± 0.06	100.0 ± 0.0	2.39 ± 0.87	7.8	1.06 ± 0.04
	dGLOBE-CE	100.0 ± 0.0	7.96 ± 3.91	3.4	1.55 ± 0.07	100.0 ± 0.0	7.28 ± 1.25	6.8	2.3 ± 0.09
	GLANCE	100.0 ± 0.0	2.34 ± 0.43	4.0	177.41 ± 0.0	100.0 ± 0.0	1.77 ± 0.16	8.0	177.35 ± 0.0
LR	Fast AReS	62.5 ± 1.82	1.24 ± 0.14	4	11.52 ± 5.39	68.19 ± 0.6	1.03 ± 0.01	8	15.2 ± 6.9
	CET	73.18 ± 4.34	1.24 ± 0.15	4.0	663.22 ± 45.34	82.51 ± 2.97	1.51 ± 0.23	6.0	442.76 ± 64.47
	GroupCF	100.0 ± 0.0	3.97 ± 2.38	4	45.04 ± 2.38	100.0 ± 0.0	4.67 ± 2.29	8	48.53 ± 2.29
	GLOBE-CE	95.74 ± 8.52	2.91 ± 0.57	2.8	0.42 ± 0.01	95.74 ± 8.52	2.25 ± 0.24	6.4	0.45 ± 0.02
	dGLOBE-CE	100.0 ± 0.0	6.71 ± 0.23	4.0	0.61 ± 0.01	100.0 ± 0.0	6.71 ± 0.23	8.0	0.88 ± 0.01
	GLANCE	100.0 ± 0.0	2.33 ± 0.38	4.0	82.09 ± 0.0	100.0 ± 0.0	1.69 ± 0.06	8.0	84.11 ± 0.0
XGB	Fast AReS	59.83 ± 3.12	1.1 ± 0.05	4	12.88 ± 5.5	66.07 ± 2.5	1.14 ± 0.1	8	17.69 ± 8.05
	CET	58.4 ± 9.3	1.06 ± 0.24	3.0	3280.17 ± 834.28	68.62 ± 15.67	1.3 ± 0.52	6.0	1787.18 ± 360.63
	GroupCF	100.0 ± 0.0	4.06 ± 2.1	4	36.07 ± 2.1	100.0 ± 0.0	4.08 ± 2.15	8	37.53 ± 2.15
	GLOBE-CE	87.17 ± 11.09	4.73 ± 0.92	2.4	1.06 ± 0.01	87.21 ± 11.04	3.09 ± 0.47	6.0	1.08 ± 0.03
	dGLOBE-CE	99.84 ± 0.31	12.46 ± 3.42	3.4	1.53 ± 0.03	99.96 ± 0.08	9.17 ± 2.01	5.6	2.23 ± 0.03
	GLANCE	99.51 ± 0.46	2.96 ± 0.82	4.0	286.26 ± 0.0	99.83 ± 0.24	2.06 ± 0.46	8.0	173.1 ± 0.0

Table 12 presents a comparative analysis of all algorithms for the COMPAS dataset, revealing distinct performance patterns. CET and Fast AReS, both with 4 and 8 actions, show very low costs across all models; however, this is largely attributable to their relatively low effectiveness scores.

Methods like GLOBE-CE, dGLOBE-CE display significantly higher effectiveness, mostly above 90% across all models, GroupCF yields perfect effectiveness of 100%. However, these methods come with higher costs, indicating that increased effectiveness is often tied to a rise in cost.

On the other hand, GLANCE method consistently achieves near-perfect or perfect effectiveness ($\sim 100\%$) across all models while maintaining much lower costs. This balance of high effectiveness and low cost makes GLANCE the optimal method for the COMPAS dataset.

Table 13 provides a comparative analysis of all algorithms for the Default Credit dataset. GLANCE method exhibits perfect effectiveness scores across both the DNN and LR models while maintaining the lowest costs, second only to Fast AReS, highlighting their superior cost-effectiveness.

In the XGB model, GroupCF-4 achieves a smaller cost compared to GLANCE-4, which, however, has better performance in terms of effectiveness. Concerning the case $s = 8$, GroupCF-8 has slightly better cost but worse effectiveness than

Table 13: Detailed results for the solution of s -GCE ($s = 4$ and $s = 8$) for Default Credit dataset. The table reports effectiveness (eff), cost (avc), size (size), and runtime, including their standard deviations for each method.

Model	Method	$s = 4$				$s = 8$			
		eff	avc	size	RunTime	eff	avc	size	RunTime
DNN	Fast AReS	18.88 ± 2.16	1.0 ± 0.0	4	789.48 ± 306.69	23.75 ± 1.81	1.02 ± 0.03	8	428.04 ± 199.29
	CET	98.87 ± 0.62	6.32 ± 2.28	3	4404.58 ± 453.7	98.53 ± 2.11	3.68 ± 1.46	4	2500.02 ± 328.94
	GroupCF	79.6 ± 20.79	1.53 ± 0.62	4	2415.7 ± 0.62	84.8 ± 13.23	2.15 ± 0.98	8	2476.21 ± 0.82
	GLOBE-CE	81.19 ± 35.33	3.76 ± 1.35	2.2	3.33 ± 0.2	95.9 ± 5.71	2.58 ± 0.78	4	3.49 ± 0.27
	dGLOBE-CE	87.38 ± 18.69	5.96 ± 4.14	3.4	4.98 ± 0.21	99.95 ± 0.04	6.77 ± 3.67	4.8	6.79 ± 0.16
	GLANCE	100.0 ± 0.0	1.2 ± 0.4	4	290.89 ± 0.0	100.0 ± 0.0	1.2 ± 0.4	8	289.46 ± 0.0
LR	Fast AReS	10.85 ± 5.45	1.07 ± 0.13	4	244.78 ± 128.93	11.67 ± 6.18	1.04 ± 0.08	8	272.64 ± 120.89
	CET	100.0 ± 0.0	3.79 ± 1.31	1	3711.21 ± 164.94	100.0 ± 0.0	2.0 ± 1.36	2	1795.08 ± 182.55
	GroupCF	95.4 ± 9.2	1.94 ± 1.2	4	306.76 ± 1.2	100.0 ± 0.0	3.98 ± 2.86	8	279.86 ± 2.86
	GLOBE-CE	99.94 ± 0.07	2.91 ± 1.55	2	1.76 ± 0.04	99.94 ± 0.07	2.13 ± 0.89	2.4	1.75 ± 0.05
	dGLOBE-CE	99.94 ± 0.07	10.38 ± 7.76	1.2	2.54 ± 0.07	99.94 ± 0.07	10.38 ± 7.76	1.2	3.51 ± 0.07
	GLANCE	100.0 ± 0.0	1.05 ± 0.11	4	243.45 ± 0.0	100.0 ± 0.0	1.05 ± 0.11	8	226.96 ± 0.0
XGB	Fast AReS	31.86 ± 5.12	1.05 ± 0.04	4	226.08 ± 107.9	36.88 ± 5.46	1.07 ± 0.06	8	280.88 ± 135.37
	CET	86.29 ± 9.94	4.5 ± 2.64	3	7982.05 ± 668.76	90.01 ± 10.44	2.61 ± 1.06	5	5105.11 ± 923.27
	GroupCF	95.2 ± 1.6	1.41 ± 0.64	4	991.53 ± 0.64	97.8 ± 0.75	1.92 ± 1.33	8	631.31 ± 1.33
	GLOBE-CE	83.69 ± 6.72	17.21 ± 2.22	3.4	2.44 ± 0.05	86.63 ± 6.0	9.78 ± 1.0	6.4	2.47 ± 0.06
	dGLOBE-CE	97.47 ± 0.82	42.58 ± 3.57	4	3.48 ± 0.09	99.08 ± 0.66	28.73 ± 9.8	8	5.05 ± 0.12
	GLANCE	98.13 ± 1.05	3.68 ± 1.64	4	319.45 ± 0.0	98.87 ± 0.59	2.14 ± 0.18	8	257.39 ± 0.0

GLANCE-8, and slightly better effectiveness. Overall, our method ensures competitive, robust, and highly efficient performance.

Table 14: Detailed results for the solution of s -GCE ($s = 4$ and $s = 8$) for the German Credit dataset. The table reports effectiveness (eff), cost (avc), size (size), and runtime, including their standard deviations for each method.

Model	Method	$s = 4$				$s = 8$			
		eff	avc	size	Runtime	eff	avc	size	Runtime
DNN	Fast AReS	52.39 ± 1.63	1.0 ± 0.0	4	119.34 ± 54.6	65.47 ± 2.2	1.0 ± 0.0	8	415.74 ± 175.82
	CET	97.3 ± 2.46	1.58 ± 0.54	3.0	230.36 ± 47.15	100.0 ± 0.0	1.27 ± 0.37	1.0	142.29 ± 27.72
	GroupCF	97.8 ± 4.4	1.85 ± 0.13	4	25.54 ± 0.13	99.6 ± 0.8	2.49 ± 0.82	8	28.93 ± 0.82
	GLOBE-CE	95.82 ± 2.04	2.11 ± 0.18	2.25	1.02 ± 0.01	95.55 ± 2.39	1.88 ± 0.36	2.2	1.03 ± 0.01
	dGLOBE-CE	97.36 ± 0.82	2.49 ± 0.27	4.0	1.57 ± 0.01	98.09 ± 1.72	2.34 ± 0.17	7.8	2.34 ± 0.03
	GLANCE	95.31 ± 3.15	1.25 ± 0.33	4.0	78.45 ± 0.0	96.43 ± 3.6	0.86 ± 0.18	8.0	78.38 ± 0.0
LR	Fast AReS	75.27 ± 2.96	1.0 ± 0.0	4	47.88 ± 23.06	71.9 ± 2.65	1.0 ± 0.0	8	59.8 ± 32.65
	CET	96.5 ± 2.85	2.42 ± 0.24	3.0	237.17 ± 11.2	98.75 ± 1.67	2.02 ± 0.33	6.0	156.14 ± 15.7
	GroupCF	97.6 ± 2.94	9.34 ± 3.85	4	7.91 ± 3.85	98.9 ± 1.65	10.56 ± 2.43	8	15.6 ± 2.33
	GLOBE-CE	57.09 ± 20.03	2.27 ± 0.33	1.0	0.44 ± 0.0	57.55 ± 19.97	2.25 ± 0.33	1.0	0.45 ± 0.0
	dGLOBE-CE	69.89 ± 15.35	2.47 ± 0.23	3.2	0.7 ± 0.01	69.89 ± 15.35	2.47 ± 0.23	5.6	1.02 ± 0.04
	GLANCE	100.0 ± 0.0	1.21 ± 0.06	4.0	61.58 ± 0.0	100.0 ± 0.0	1.18 ± 0.05	8.0	63.1 ± 0.0
XGB	Fast AReS	51.27 ± 1.57	1.0 ± 0.0	4	55.01 ± 27.27	68.88 ± 1.27	1.0 ± 0.0	8	64.77 ± 29.67
	CET	100.0 ± 0.0	2.73 ± 0.49	3.0	347.41 ± 30.21	100.0 ± 0.0	2.18 ± 0.37	5.0	239.2 ± 25.84
	GroupCF	100.0 ± 0.0	5.78 ± 4.11	4	5.87 ± 4.11	100.0 ± 0.0	4.05 ± 2.55	8	7.84 ± 2.55
	GLOBE-CE	77.05 ± 11.26	2.52 ± 0.33	1.0	1.34 ± 0.03	77.05 ± 11.26	2.49 ± 0.34	1.0	1.36 ± 0.05
	dGLOBE-CE	86.96 ± 9.79	2.66 ± 0.77	3.6	2.09 ± 0.04	88.17 ± 8.2	2.64 ± 0.78	6.2	3.06 ± 0.04
	GLANCE	100.0 ± 0.0	1.06 ± 0.03	4.0	67.36 ± 0.0	100.0 ± 0.0	1.02 ± 0.04	8.0	68.96 ± 0.0

Table 14 presents a comparative analysis of all algorithms for the German Credit dataset. Fast AReS remains the weakest method overall, continuing to exhibit poor effectiveness. Notably, while CET incurs a slightly higher cost than on the COMPAS dataset, it achieves significantly greater effectiveness, and

the increase in cost is quite reasonable. The **GLOBE-CE** and **dGLOBE-CE** methods demonstrate mixed results. They perform relatively well under the DNN model, achieving effectiveness scores above 90%, but their effectiveness declines when applied to the LR and XGB models. On the other hand, **GLANCE** continues to excel due to its robustness and consistently high performance. This method consistently reaches near-perfect effectiveness ($\sim 100\%$, and only for DNN 95%-97%) across all models while maintaining very low costs. Notably, **GLANCE-8** achieves the lowest cost of 0.86 under the DNN model, while still maintaining high effectiveness.

Table 15: Detailed results for the solution of s -GCE ($s = 4$ and $s = 8$) for HELOC dataset. The table reports effectiveness (eff), cost (avc), size (size), and runtime, including their standard deviations for each method.

Model	Method	$s = 4$				$s = 8$			
		eff	avc	size	RunTime	eff	avc	size	RunTime
DNN	Fast AReS	12.19 ± 0.58	1.03 ± 0.05	4	1562.21 ± 656.59	15.44 ± 1.91	1.05 ± 0.06	8	1070.19 ± 558.28
	CET	86.78 ± 10.62	8.67 ± 3.25	1.0	11090.16 ± 4597.13	99.36 ± 0.92	8.86 ± 2.99	4.0	6758.87 ± 3384.51
	GroupCF	80.4 ± 10.17	3.09 ± 0.91	4	468.52 ± 0.91	84.8 ± 12.32	1.98 ± 0.5	8	501.45 ± 2.5
	GLOBE-CE	47.18 ± 45.02	20.44 ± 24.18	2.4	1.43 ± 0.13	29.02 ± 39.47	7.88 ± 7.19	2.2	1.44 ± 0.02
	dGLOBE-CE	99.96 ± 0.05	11.07 ± 8.6	2.0	2.2 ± 0.14	100.0 ± 0.0	6.65 ± 0.15	4.4	3.2 ± 0.22
	GLANCE	99.94 ± 0.05	11.24 ± 1.37	4.0	307.06 ± 0.0	99.98 ± 0.04	9.42 ± 2.22	8.0	301.47 ± 0.0
LR	Fast AReS	9.23 ± 1.24	1.12 ± 0.1	4	961.23 ± 541.41	10.95 ± 1.73	1.11 ± 0.07	8	901.3 ± 493.42
	CET	100.0 ± 0.0	3.57 ± 1.48	2.0	2662.77 ± 739.88	100.0 ± 0.0	2.99 ± 1.3	2.0	1628.08 ± 344.57
	GroupCF	90.6 ± 3.93	2.4 ± 1.38	4	209.26 ± 1.38	96.6 ± 1.96	1.98 ± 0.5	8	249.14 ± 0.5
	GLOBE-CE	99.9 ± 0.0	0.66 ± 0.1	4.0	0.65 ± 0.06	99.9 ± 0.0	0.55 ± 0.08	8.0	0.64 ± 0.02
	dGLOBE-CE	99.9 ± 0.0	1.63 ± 0.35	4.0	0.94 ± 0.05	99.9 ± 0.0	1.63 ± 0.35	8.0	1.35 ± 0.04
	GLANCE	100.0 ± 0.0	1.55 ± 0.54	4.0	214.6 ± 0.0	100.0 ± 0.0	1.2 ± 0.12	8.0	217.9 ± 0.0
XGB	Fast AReS	8.49 ± 1.32	1.16 ± 0.13	4	963.0 ± 492.98	11.22 ± 2.05	1.09 ± 0.09	8	829.62 ± 420.35
	CET	86.78 ± 6.7	12.51 ± 2.75	2.0	17339.7 ± 1363.44	90.25 ± 2.51	12.99 ± 3.49	6.0	9108.94 ± 1624.21
	GroupCF	78.4 ± 5.82	5.63 ± 1.93	4	201.24 ± 1.93	81.4 ± 4.22	5.14 ± 1.46	8	197.68 ± 1.46
	GLOBE-CE	28.33 ± 5.14	32.73 ± 0.48	3.2	1.18 ± 0.02	29.18 ± 4.54	16.41 ± 0.3	2.8	1.18 ± 0.02
	dGLOBE-CE	77.64 ± 11.51	128.0 ± 0.0	4.0	1.77 ± 0.03	81.95 ± 10.38	128.0 ± 0.0	8.0	2.55 ± 0.04
	GLANCE	98.94 ± 0.66	19.99 ± 1.91	4.0	183.45 ± 0.0	99.0 ± 0.55	16.65 ± 2.44	8.0	182.83 ± 0.0

Table 15 presents a comparative analysis of all algorithms for the Heloc dataset, which, due to its exclusively numeric features, poses challenges in achieving low costs. Despite this complexity, the methods **GLANCE**, and **dGLOBE-CE** stand out by delivering near-perfect or perfect effectiveness in the DNN models, while **GLANCE**, **dGLOBE-CE**, and **GLOBE-CE** excel in the LR models. **dGLOBE-CE-8** provides the best combination of effectiveness and cost for DNN, and **GLOBE-CE-8** achieves the same for LR. For the XGB models, **GLANCE** leads in effectiveness across all methods. Overall, our methods demonstrate strong and consistent performance, unlike other methods, where results fluctuate considerably.

Upon evaluating the performance across the five datasets — COMPAS, German Credit, Default Credit, HELOC, and Adult Income — it is evident that our method, **GLANCE**, consistently demonstrates concrete performance. They achieve near-perfect or perfect effectiveness scores while maintaining low costs across different models, such as DNN, LR, and XGB. This robustness and consistency underline their efficiency and practicality in handling diverse datasets and complexities.

I Comparative Evaluation with Different Counterfactual Generation Methods

Table 16: Evaluation of the effectiveness (eff) and average recourse cost (avc) of **GLANCE** with different candidate action generation methods for s -GCE ($s = 4$), across multiple datasets and models.

Dataset	size	Generation Algorithm	DNN		LR		XGB	
			eff	avc	eff	avc	eff	avc
Adult	4	Dice	100.0 ± 0.0	4.6 ± 0.73	100.0 ± 0.0	1.04 ± 0.07	99.85 ± 0.12	5.98 ± 4.22
		NearestNeighbors	100.0 ± 0.0	6.04 ± 0.35	100.0 ± 0.0	3.76 ± 0.96	100.0 ± 0.01	4.53 ± 0.56
		NearestNeighborsScaled	99.99 ± 0.03	5.04 ± 0.51	100.0 ± 0.0	3.19 ± 0.51	99.98 ± 0.03	4.12 ± 0.31
		RandomSampling	98.01 ± 0.66	2.03 ± 0.01	100.0 ± 0.0	0.72 ± 0.12	99.85 ± 0.19	2.1 ± 0.19
	8	Dice	100.0 ± 0.0	3.96 ± 0.56	100.0 ± 0.0	1.03 ± 0.07	99.87 ± 0.09	3.85 ± 2.33
		NearestNeighbors	100.0 ± 0.01	4.99 ± 0.62	100.0 ± 0.0	3.22 ± 0.49	100.0 ± 0.0	4.43 ± 0.55
		NearestNeighborsScaled	100.0 ± 0.0	4.44 ± 0.15	100.0 ± 0.0	2.96 ± 0.62	99.98 ± 0.03	3.9 ± 0.41
		RandomSampling	95.36 ± 3.8	2.84 ± 0.8	100.0 ± 0.0	0.67 ± 0.07	99.76 ± 0.37	2.13 ± 0.17
COMPAS	4	Dice	100.0 ± 0.0	2.34 ± 0.43	100.0 ± 0.0	2.33 ± 0.38	99.51 ± 0.46	2.96 ± 0.82
		NearestNeighbors	100.0 ± 0.0	2.27 ± 0.31	100.0 ± 0.0	2.53 ± 0.32	99.6 ± 0.34	2.95 ± 0.58
		NearestNeighborsScaled	100.0 ± 0.0	1.74 ± 0.38	100.0 ± 0.0	2.14 ± 0.15	99.44 ± 0.54	3.0 ± 0.33
		RandomSampling	100.0 ± 0.0	2.08 ± 0.21	100.0 ± 0.0	2.21 ± 0.2	99.88 ± 0.16	2.83 ± 0.76
	8	Dice	100.0 ± 0.0	1.77 ± 0.16	100.0 ± 0.0	1.69 ± 0.06	99.83 ± 0.24	2.06 ± 0.46
		NearestNeighbors	100.0 ± 0.0	1.71 ± 0.18	100.0 ± 0.0	1.90 ± 0.12	99.60 ± 0.34	1.80 ± 0.16
		NearestNeighborsScaled	100.0 ± 0.0	1.08 ± 0.08	100.0 ± 0.0	1.81 ± 0.18	99.48 ± 0.57	1.88 ± 0.09
		RandomSampling	100.0 ± 0.0	1.74 ± 0.22	100.0 ± 0.0	1.78 ± 0.25	99.84 ± 0.24	2.06 ± 0.21
Default Credit	4	Dice	100.0 ± 0.0	1.2 ± 0.4	100.0 ± 0.0	1.05 ± 0.11	98.13 ± 1.05	3.68 ± 1.64
		NearestNeighbors	100.0 ± 0.0	4.07 ± 0.08	100.0 ± 0.0	1.78 ± 0.39	100.0 ± 0.0	3.8 ± 0.44
		NearestNeighborsScaled	100.0 ± 0.0	3.02 ± 0.58	100.0 ± 0.0	1.11 ± 0.14	100.0 ± 0.0	3.09 ± 0.42
		RandomSampling	100.0 ± 0.0	1.0 ± 0.0	99.94 ± 0.12	1.0 ± 0.0	91.52 ± 4.44	2.25 ± 1.06
	8	Dice	100.0 ± 0.0	1.20 ± 0.40	100.0 ± 0.0	1.05 ± 0.11	98.87 ± 0.59	2.14 ± 0.18
		NearestNeighbors	100.0 ± 0.0	3.84 ± 0.26	100.0 ± 0.0	1.39 ± 0.11	100.0 ± 0.0	3.20 ± 0.45
		NearestNeighborsScaled	100.0 ± 0.0	2.50 ± 0.24	100.0 ± 0.0	1.01 ± 0.00	100.0 ± 0.0	2.40 ± 0.31
		RandomSampling	99.82 ± 0.29	1.07 ± 0.14	99.94 ± 0.12	1.00 ± 0.00	93.86 ± 2.69	1.51 ± 0.52
German Credit	4	Dice	99.46 ± 1.08	1.22 ± 0.41	100.0 ± 0.0	1.21 ± 0.06	100.0 ± 0.0	1.05 ± 0.02
		NearestNeighbors	100.0 ± 0.0	4.9 ± 0.69	100.0 ± 0.0	4.21 ± 0.56	100.0 ± 0.0	3.67 ± 0.58
		NearestNeighborsScaled	100.0 ± 0.0	2.1 ± 0.4	100.0 ± 0.0	2.02 ± 0.27	100.0 ± 0.0	1.75 ± 0.2
		RandomSampling	99.43 ± 1.14	1.0 ± 0.2	100.0 ± 0.0	1.31 ± 0.15	100.0 ± 0.0	1.14 ± 0.07
	8	Dice	99.46 ± 1.08	0.78 ± 0.27	100.0 ± 0.0	1.15 ± 0.03	100.0 ± 0.0	0.97 ± 0.08
		NearestNeighbors	100.0 ± 0.0	3.94 ± 0.39	100.0 ± 0.0	3.98 ± 0.55	100.0 ± 0.0	3.63 ± 0.58
		NearestNeighborsScaled	100.0 ± 0.0	1.65 ± 0.14	100.0 ± 0.0	1.70 ± 0.20	100.0 ± 0.0	1.62 ± 0.13
		RandomSampling	100.0 ± 0.0	0.70 ± 0.18	100.0 ± 0.0	1.19 ± 0.05	100.0 ± 0.0	1.06 ± 0.10
HELOC	4	Dice	99.94 ± 0.05	11.24 ± 1.37	100.0 ± 0.0	1.55 ± 0.54	98.94 ± 0.66	19.99 ± 1.91
		NearestNeighbors	99.82 ± 0.15	20.18 ± 3.28	99.94 ± 0.05	21.52 ± 1.33	99.51 ± 0.42	19.3 ± 2.66
		NearestNeighborsScaled	99.79 ± 0.3	18.88 ± 2.11	99.94 ± 0.12	20.95 ± 3.47	99.68 ± 0.13	20.92 ± 3.96
		RandomSampling	94.02 ± 4.28	2.53 ± 1.12	100.0 ± 0.0	1.4 ± 0.27	82.75 ± 5.2	9.6 ± 1.84
	8	Dice	99.98 ± 0.04	9.42 ± 2.22	100.0 ± 0.0	1.20 ± 0.12	99.00 ± 0.55	16.65 ± 2.44
		NearestNeighbors	99.75 ± 0.26	16.07 ± 1.32	99.88 ± 0.14	17.30 ± 1.90	99.49 ± 0.47	15.76 ± 1.71
		NearestNeighborsScaled	99.71 ± 0.15	16.17 ± 1.72	99.88 ± 0.15	17.39 ± 0.69	99.72 ± 0.17	18.58 ± 1.88
		RandomSampling	98.55 ± 0.45	10.01 ± 0.53	100.0 ± 0.0	1.19 ± 0.15	84.76 ± 4.77	7.11 ± 1.13

Table 16 presents a comprehensive comparison of **GLANCE** utilizing the counterfactual generation methods described in Appendix G, i.e., DiCE, NearestNeighbors, NearestNeighborsScaled, and RandomSampling, for the s -GCE problem with $s = 4$ and $s = 8$. Across all datasets and models, **GLANCE** consistently exhibits superb performance in terms of effectiveness, frequently achieving near 100%. Since the performance in terms of effectiveness is comparable, we will focus on the cost our algorithms achieved under the different generation methods. The best performance is observed with the RandomSampling method, achieving the best results in 41 out of 60 cases. DiCE, which is regarded as state-of-the-art, follows, achieves the lowest cost in 15 out of 60 cases. NearestNeighbors

and NearestNeighborsScaled achieve the best cost in only 1 out of 60 and 3 out of 60 cases, respectively. In general, **GLANCE** can demonstrate great performance under all action generation methods, maintaining high effectiveness and low costs in almost all cases.

J Impact of Different Clustering Algorithms

In the initial step of **GLANCE**, we used k-means as the default clustering method. We also experimented with Gaussian Mixture Models (GMM) and agglomerative clustering on the COMPAS and German Credit datasets, using 100 initial clusters (`n.initial.clusters = 100`) and DiCE as the local counterfactual generation method. Across these settings, we did not find any meaningful differences in terms of effectiveness or cost. This was expected, as the primary goal at this stage is to obtain a refined partitioning into many small clusters. In Table 17 we showcase our results for $s = 4$ and $s = 8$ global actions.

Table 17: Evaluation of the effectiveness (eff) and average recourse cost (avc) of **GLANCE** with different clustering algorithms for s -GCE ($s = 4$ and $s = 8$), across multiple datasets and models.

Dataset	size	Clustering Algorithm	DNN		LR		XGB	
			eff	avc	eff	avc	eff	avc
COMPAS	4	Kmeans	100.0 ± 0.0	2.34 ± 0.43	100.0 ± 0.0	2.33 ± 0.38	99.51 ± 0.46	2.96 ± 0.82
		Agglomerative	100.0 ± 0.0	2.85 ± 0.38	100.0 ± 0.0	2.27 ± 0.43	99.88 ± 0.16	3.33 ± 0.89
		GMM	100.0 ± 0.0	2.39 ± 0.61	100.0 ± 0.0	2.33 ± 0.61	99.84 ± 0.23	3.5 ± 0.56
	8	Kmeans	100.0 ± 0.0	1.77 ± 0.16	100.0 ± 0.0	1.69 ± 0.06	99.83 ± 0.24	2.06 ± 0.46
		Agglomerative	100.0 ± 0.0	1.82 ± 0.15	100.0 ± 0.0	1.81 ± 0.13	99.96 ± 0.08	2.02 ± 0.18
		GMM	100.0 ± 0.0	1.77 ± 0.11	100.0 ± 0.0	1.71 ± 0.07	99.96 ± 0.08	2.27 ± 0.38
German Credit	4	Kmeans	95.31 ± 3.15	1.25 ± 0.33	100.0 ± 0.0	1.21 ± 0.06	100.0 ± 0.0	1.06 ± 0.03
		Agglomerative	99.46 ± 1.08	1.46 ± 0.68	100.0 ± 0.0	1.45 ± 0.32	100.0 ± 0.0	1.05 ± 0.06
		GMM	99.46 ± 1.08	1.23 ± 0.37	100.0 ± 0.0	1.17 ± 0.04	100.0 ± 0.0	1.16 ± 0.21
	8	Kmeans	96.43 ± 3.6	0.86 ± 0.18	100.0 ± 0.0	1.18 ± 0.05	100.0 ± 0.0	1.02 ± 0.04
		Agglomerative	99.46 ± 1.08	0.94 ± 0.29	100.0 ± 0.0	1.15 ± 0.02	100.0 ± 0.0	0.96 ± 0.11
		GMM	100.0 ± 0.0	0.77 ± 0.28	100.0 ± 0.0	1.15 ± 0.02	100.0 ± 0.0	1.01 ± 0.03
Default Credit	4	Kmeans	100.0 ± 0.0	1.20 ± 0.40	100.0 ± 0.0	1.05 ± 0.11	98.13 ± 1.05	3.68 ± 1.64
		Agglomerative	99.97 ± 0.06	1.11 ± 0.45	100.0 ± 0.0	1.33 ± 0.28	95.83 ± 3.29	3.66 ± 1.53
		GMM	100.0 ± 0.0	1.01 ± 0.01	100.0 ± 0.0	1.11 ± 0.21	97.26 ± 1.67	3.07 ± 1.02
	8	Kmeans	100.0 ± 0.0	1.2 ± 0.4	100.0 ± 0.0	1.05 ± 0.11	98.87 ± 0.59	2.14 ± 0.18
		Agglomerative	100.0 ± 0.0	1.05 ± 0.08	100.0 ± 0.0	1.1 ± 0.29	98.42 ± 1.09	2.03 ± 0.28
		GMM	100.0 ± 0.0	1.02 ± 0.13	100.0 ± 0.0	1.1 ± 0.18	99.22 ± 0.78	2.43 ± 0.8
Adult	4	Kmeans	100.0 ± 0.0	4.6 ± 0.73	100.0 ± 0.0	1.04 ± 0.07	99.85 ± 0.12	4.9 ± 3.41
		Agglomerative	100.0 ± 0.0	4.73 ± 0.45	100.0 ± 0.0	1.08 ± 0.13	99.77 ± 0.2	4.15 ± 1.7
		GMM	100.0 ± 0.0	4.43 ± 0.39	100.0 ± 0.0	1.1 ± 0.24	99.74 ± 0.24	5.07 ± 3.8
	8	Kmeans	100.0 ± 0.0	3.96 ± 0.56	100.0 ± 0.0	1.03 ± 0.07	99.87 ± 0.09	3.85 ± 2.33
		Agglomerative	100.0 ± 0.0	3.99 ± 0.21	100.0 ± 0.0	1.02 ± 0.22	99.89 ± 0.06	4.31 ± 2.47
		GMM	100.0 ± 0.0	3.68 ± 0.52	100.0 ± 0.0	0.99 ± 0.19	99.78 ± 0.24	2.75 ± 0.93
HELOC	4	Kmeans	99.94 ± 0.05	11.24 ± 1.37	100.0 ± 0.0	1.55 ± 0.54	98.94 ± 0.66	19.99 ± 1.91
		Agglomerative	99.96 ± 0.08	8.16 ± 1.77	100.0 ± 0.0	1.43 ± 0.16	99.41 ± 0.49	23.61 ± 5.17
		GMM	100.0 ± 0.0	8.01 ± 2.3	100.0 ± 0.0	1.45 ± 0.28	99.04 ± 0.51	22.62 ± 6.0
	8	Kmeans	99.98 ± 0.04	9.42 ± 2.22	100.0 ± 0.0	1.2 ± 0.12	99.0 ± 0.55	16.65 ± 2.44
		Agglomerative	99.96 ± 0.08	6.72 ± 0.81	100.0 ± 0.0	1.25 ± 0.18	99.94 ± 0.33	14.13 ± 1.78
		GMM	100.0 ± 0.0	7.36 ± 2.85	100.0 ± 0.0	1.2 ± 0.2	99.32 ± 0.71	14.67 ± 2.04

Table 18: Effectiveness (eff) and average recourse cost (avc) of GCEs generated by GLANCE for $s = 4$ compared to local counterfactuals. Despite using only four global actions, GLANCE consistently achieves lower costs, indicating higher efficiency and generalizability.

Dataset	Method	DNN		LR		XGB	
		eff	avc	eff	avc	eff	avc
COMPAS	GLANCE	100.0 \pm 0.0	2.34 \pm 0.43	100.0 \pm 0.0	2.33 \pm 0.38	99.51 \pm 0.46	2.96 \pm 0.82
	Local	100.0 \pm 0.0	2.75 \pm 0.53	100.0 \pm 0.0	2.73 \pm 0.23	100.0 \pm 0.0	2.87 \pm 0.27
German Credit	GLANCE	95.31 \pm 3.15	1.25 \pm 0.33	100.0 \pm 0.0	1.21 \pm 0.06	100.0 \pm 0.0	1.06 \pm 0.03
	Local	100.0 \pm 0.0	4.74 \pm 0.93	100.0 \pm 0.0	4.90 \pm 0.40	100.0 \pm 0.0	5.09 \pm 0.33
Default Credit	GLANCE	100.0 \pm 0.0	1.20 \pm 0.40	100.0 \pm 0.0	1.05 \pm 0.11	98.13 \pm 1.05	3.68 \pm 1.64
	Local	100.0 \pm 0.0	6.41 \pm 0.24	100.0 \pm 0.0	7.02 \pm 0.29	100.0 \pm 0.0	5.67 \pm 0.19
Adult	GLANCE	100.0 \pm 0.0	4.6 \pm 0.73	100.0 \pm 0.0	1.04 \pm 0.07	99.85 \pm 0.12	4.9 \pm 3.41
	Local	100.0 \pm 0.0	6.61 \pm 0.16	100.0 \pm 0.0	6.34 \pm 0.14	100.0 \pm 0.0	6.68 \pm 0.08
HELOC	GLANCE	99.94 \pm 0.05	11.24 \pm 1.37	100.0 \pm 0.0	1.55 \pm 0.54	98.94 \pm 0.66	19.99 \pm 1.91
	Local	100.0 \pm 0.0	10.45 \pm 0.31	100.0 \pm 0.0	8.03 \pm 0.27	100.0 \pm 0.0	10.38 \pm 0.56

K Comparing Local and Global Counterfactual Costs

To illustrate the challenges in defining optimal solutions for global counterfactual explanations, we conducted an experiment comparing the cost of local counterfactuals to the global counterfactual actions generated by our method. Using the Compas and German Credit datasets, we generated all possible local counterfactuals for each instance and calculated the average recourse cost across the datasets. The results are presented in Table 18 under the row “Local”.

Surprisingly, although GLANCE generates only 4 global counterfactual actions, it achieves significantly lower average recourse costs than the local counterfactuals for the majority of model-dataset combinations, even though both were generated using the same local counterfactual method. This counterintuitive result reveals the inherent variability and complexity in local counterfactual generation, emphasizing the difficulty in defining an optimal solution at both local and global levels.

Overall, this experiment demonstrates that our global approach not only achieves cost-efficient global counterfactuals but also highlights the practical and theoretical limitations of the domain.

L Effect of Initial Clusters and Number of Diverse Actions on GLANCE

To evaluate how key parameters influence the quality of solutions in GLANCE, we systematically analyzed the role of initial clusters and the number of diverse candidate actions generated per cluster. The product of these parameters defines

Table 19: Effectiveness (eff) of GCEs generated by GLANCE with $s = 4$ on the Default Credit dataset. We vary the number of initial clusters from 10 to 100 (step size 10) and the number of diverse actions per cluster from 5 to 50 (step size 5). Effectiveness is reported as the mean over 5-fold cross-validation.

Model	Diverse Actions	Number of Initial Clusters									
		10.0	20.0	30.0	40.0	50.0	60.0	70.0	80.0	90.0	100.0
DNN	5	99.91	100.00	99.86	99.97	100.00	99.94	100.00	99.97	99.97	100.00
	10	99.91	100.00	99.88	99.97	99.97	100.00	99.97	99.97	99.97	99.97
	15	99.89	100.00	99.94	100.00	99.97	99.94	99.97	99.97	100.00	100.00
	20	99.91	100.00	99.97	100.00	99.97	99.97	100.00	99.97	99.94	100.00
	25	99.89	100.00	100.00	99.97	99.97	99.97	99.94	100.00	99.97	99.97
	30	99.94	100.00	99.97	100.00	99.97	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	35	99.94	99.97	99.97	99.97	99.97	100.00	99.97	99.97	99.97	100.00
	40	99.94	100.00	100.00	99.97	99.97	99.97	99.97	99.97	100.00	100.00
	45	99.94	100.00	99.94	100.00	100.00	99.97	99.97	99.97	100.00	100.00
	50	99.91	100.00	99.97	99.97	99.97	99.97	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
LR	5	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	10	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	15	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	20	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	25	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	30	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	35	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	40	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	45	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	50	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
XGB	5	94.42	94.39	95.48	96.50	95.53	94.95	96.29	96.14	96.42	94.59
	10	94.03	96.08	97.38	95.99	95.85	98.24	96.79	96.94	95.54	96.68
	15	95.95	95.97	97.73	96.30	97.39	98.01	97.97	97.94	97.92	96.49
	20	96.02	96.62	97.79	96.19	98.54	98.54	98.62	98.52	98.11	98.34
	25	96.66	95.72	98.57	96.84	98.62	98.65	98.57	97.76	98.21	98.36
	30	96.68	96.69	98.62	96.31	98.49	98.67	98.46	98.49	98.43	98.97
	35	96.73	97.17	99.00	97.56	98.67	98.85	98.46	98.84	98.58	98.70
	40	96.94	97.69	98.82	97.44	98.90	98.63	98.92	99.07	98.80	98.99
	45	97.76	98.51	98.82	97.69	98.82	99.00	98.44	98.89	98.82	99.07
	50	97.20	98.49	98.82	98.63	98.74	99.11	98.74	98.94	98.87	99.01

the total number of generated actions, which directly impacts the algorithm’s performance.

Increasing the number of generated actions often improves effectiveness but typically comes at the expense of increased cost. However, selecting a subset of actions with optimal effectiveness tends to reduce overall cost. This pattern is clearly observed in Tables 19 to 22.

Regarding individual parameter effects, increasing the number of initial clusters proves particularly beneficial for larger datasets with widely distributed points. This approach allows for better grouping in the feature space, thereby enhancing the relevance and feasibility of the generated counterfactual actions. Conversely, increasing the diversity of candidate actions is more advantageous for complex models with intricate decision boundaries. A higher diversity ensures that the generated counterfactual actions are well-aligned with the model’s structure, leading to better adaptation to the complexities of the decision boundary.

Table 20: Average Recourse Cost (avc) of GCEs generated by **GLANCE** with $s = 4$ on the Default Credit dataset. We vary the number of initial clusters from 10 to 100 (step size 10) and the number of diverse actions per cluster from 5 to 50 (step size 5). Average Recourse Cost is reported as the mean over 5-fold cross-validation.

Model	Diverse Actions	Number of Initial Clusters									
		10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
DNN	5	4.85	3.15	1.45	1.58	1.40	2.27	1.13	2.65	1.41	1.32
	10	2.91	2.53	1.98	1.41	1.59	1.39	1.33	1.51	1.03	1.28
	15	4.66	1.90	1.19	1.25	1.21	1.01	1.03	1.11	1.02	1.03
	20	2.76	1.71	1.27	1.39	1.02	1.00	1.01	1.08	1.02	1.01
	25	3.91	1.96	1.27	1.40	1.11	1.01	1.29	1.25	1.02	1.00
	30	2.16	1.90	1.27	1.40	1.01	1.01	1.21	1.28	1.01	1.01
	35	2.16	1.62	1.27	1.39	1.00	1.01	1.29	1.07	1.00	1.00
	40	1.82	1.47	1.21	1.23	1.00	1.01	1.02	1.19	1.01	1.01
	45	1.78	1.54	1.21	1.07	1.01	1.00	1.02	1.07	1.00	1.01
	50	1.82	1.34	1.02	1.03	1.01	1.00	1.22	1.08	1.01	1.01
LR	5	1.93	1.43	1.33	1.47	1.45	1.48	1.30	1.27	1.32	1.51
	10	1.91	1.13	1.18	1.34	1.43	1.29	1.26	1.09	1.02	1.38
	15	1.59	1.13	1.17	1.27	1.23	1.34	1.22	1.09	1.23	1.17
	20	1.22	1.01	1.27	1.35	1.22	1.24	1.20	1.11	0.99	1.08
	25	1.20	1.13	1.19	1.10	1.11	1.32	1.19	1.05	1.17	1.10
	30	1.20	1.00	1.27	1.13	1.22	1.20	1.09	1.19	1.21	1.18
	35	1.11	1.00	1.16	1.12	1.15	1.17	1.05	0.99	1.07	1.23
	40	1.11	1.00	1.20	1.16	1.10	1.11	1.11	1.00	0.99	0.99
	45	1.11	1.00	1.11	1.07	1.08	1.06	1.18	0.97	1.21	0.98
	50	1.11	1.00	1.05	1.07	1.07	1.15	1.06	1.09	1.07	0.96
XGB	5	3.44	3.43	2.83	2.76	3.30	2.99	2.67	2.67	2.65	3.39
	10	2.97	2.81	2.91	3.88	5.08	4.05	2.97	2.89	2.99	3.47
	15	3.13	2.47	2.83	2.81	3.92	3.89	3.56	3.30	3.26	4.06
	20	2.98	3.35	3.81	3.10	4.08	4.38	3.69	3.37	3.17	4.04
	25	2.95	3.15	3.81	3.03	2.63	3.29	4.26	3.75	3.75	3.84
	30	3.42	3.82	3.97	3.16	4.59	2.97	4.48	3.23	3.57	4.45
	35	2.65	3.01	4.18	3.06	5.12	4.24	3.27	3.43	4.10	3.75
	40	2.43	3.09	3.39	3.98	3.54	4.57	4.12	3.52	3.74	4.59
	45	2.57	3.83	3.39	4.03	2.84	4.84	5.66	4.11	3.47	5.14
	50	2.50	3.08	2.89	3.79	3.58	3.94	4.99	4.39	4.45	3.77

Table 21: Effectiveness (eff) of GCEs generated by GLANCE with $s = 4$ on the HELOC dataset. We vary the number of initial clusters from 10 to 100 (step size 10) and the number of diverse actions per cluster from 5 to 50 (step size 5). Effectiveness is reported as the mean over 5-fold cross-validation.

Model	Diverse Actions	Number of Initial Clusters									
		10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
DNN	5	99.21	99.67	99.61	99.34	99.53	99.46	99.88	99.69	99.88	99.61
	10	99.41	99.66	99.22	99.28	99.43	99.92	99.92	99.86	99.92	99.92
	15	99.36	99.08	99.21	99.27	99.39	99.94	99.92	99.73	99.92	99.94
	20	99.72	99.08	99.14	99.67	99.92	99.89	99.98	99.92	99.97	99.98
	25	99.74	99.08	99.14	99.39	99.98	99.92	99.98	99.96	99.98	99.98
	30	99.78	99.08	99.23	99.98	99.98	100.00	99.95	99.98	99.96	99.98
	35	99.78	99.10	99.27	99.98	100.00	100.00	99.98	99.98	99.96	99.98
	40	99.76	98.89	99.60	100.00	100.00	99.98	99.94	99.98	99.98	100.00
	45	99.76	99.12	99.65	100.00	99.98	99.98	100.00	99.98	99.98	99.96
	50	99.76	99.12	99.65	100.00	99.98	100.00	99.94	99.98	99.98	99.96
LR	5	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	10	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	15	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	20	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	25	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	30	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	35	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	40	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	45	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	50	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
XGB	5	87.66	91.56	94.14	94.27	95.33	96.28	97.12	97.34	98.02	98.19
	10	90.45	95.79	96.01	97.95	97.86	98.57	98.39	98.73	98.64	99.38
	15	93.13	96.53	96.93	97.94	98.05	98.40	98.69	98.82	98.92	99.32
	20	94.71	97.87	96.89	98.26	98.34	98.49	99.13	99.00	98.94	99.42
	25	95.23	97.80	97.55	98.71	98.98	98.94	99.01	99.07	98.99	99.58
	30	96.14	97.76	98.65	98.84	98.62	99.00	99.07	98.98	99.38	99.38
	35	95.96	98.17	98.92	99.01	99.02	99.15	99.07	98.83	99.39	99.53
	40	96.51	98.63	99.25	99.34	99.40	99.20	99.58	99.17	99.57	99.72
	45	97.43	98.97	99.27	99.37	99.39	99.13	99.54	99.54	99.58	99.85
	50	97.95	98.89	99.30	99.24	99.49	99.26	99.66	99.43	99.62	99.91

Table 22: Average Recourse Cost (avc) of GCEs generated by GLANCE with $s = 4$ on the HELOC dataset. We vary the number of initial clusters from 10 to 100 (step size 10) and the number of diverse actions per cluster from 5 to 50 (step size 5). Average Recourse Cost is reported as the mean over 5-fold cross-validation.

Model	Diverse Actions	Number of Initial Clusters									
		10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
DNN	5	9.03	7.44	10.79	9.14	11.58	10.49	10.20	11.21	9.67	10.55
	10	10.97	10.12	10.58	9.85	9.97	10.77	10.95	11.35	10.37	11.25
	15	10.54	11.09	10.96	10.35	10.36	10.23	10.57	11.17	9.83	9.43
	20	10.85	11.27	11.35	10.38	11.87	12.11	10.98	11.87	10.19	10.50
	25	10.80	11.30	11.86	10.13	10.76	11.54	11.51	11.23	10.09	11.75
	30	11.70	11.08	10.87	12.77	10.92	11.51	10.96	10.80	10.34	9.54
	35	11.70	11.06	10.86	11.70	11.97	12.22	10.54	11.08	10.11	10.82
	40	12.03	11.06	11.01	11.29	11.56	12.22	10.87	11.48	10.12	10.81
	45	12.03	11.25	11.63	12.47	11.59	12.65	11.90	9.85	10.21	8.84
	50	12.03	11.20	11.62	12.17	11.59	11.64	11.67	10.70	11.39	11.52
LR	5	2.67	2.40	1.92	1.77	1.78	1.92	2.00	1.72	1.66	1.68
	10	1.91	2.04	1.88	1.63	1.79	1.66	1.66	1.50	1.57	1.52
	15	2.09	1.73	1.65	1.77	1.48	1.41	1.56	1.49	1.46	1.35
	20	1.80	1.56	1.59	1.60	1.54	1.52	1.59	1.53	1.47	1.25
	25	1.80	1.65	1.62	1.51	1.51	1.52	1.50	1.48	1.43	1.46
	30	1.69	1.62	1.54	1.51	1.57	1.38	1.52	1.52	1.43	1.32
	35	1.69	1.62	1.57	1.41	1.49	1.24	1.43	1.40	1.49	1.34
	40	1.66	1.53	1.41	1.38	1.52	1.28	1.34	1.39	1.40	1.35
	45	1.64	1.53	1.50	1.40	1.46	1.30	1.43	1.39	1.37	1.31
	50	1.64	1.47	1.44	1.31	1.46	1.27	1.37	1.43	1.23	1.35
XGB	5	12.22	14.05	15.44	14.77	15.91	16.25	17.14	17.13	17.87	18.28
	10	13.83	16.14	16.51	18.75	17.54	17.57	20.25	20.62	21.32	25.72
	15	15.33	18.93	17.05	17.40	18.07	21.27	19.51	21.48	27.93	18.61
	20	14.92	18.59	16.79	20.42	21.98	23.13	22.44	20.12	22.97	23.07
	25	16.03	20.48	17.85	19.41	22.98	22.43	21.69	25.36	27.18	22.68
	30	15.74	20.30	18.35	21.33	23.88	24.85	23.86	23.11	24.39	24.77
	35	17.16	22.75	20.80	21.62	23.70	27.08	24.47	20.27	25.74	24.13
	40	16.58	25.14	21.67	23.77	24.82	29.50	26.66	23.40	26.58	29.42
	45	18.55	25.83	22.86	25.32	25.87	26.71	25.22	25.62	22.86	27.09
	50	18.75	23.21	26.56	24.85	28.62	27.21	24.82	28.62	24.27	26.10

M Addressing Potential Edge Cases in Recourse Algorithms

While the proposed algorithms are designed to provide robust and actionable recourse, certain edge cases may pose challenges:

Highly nonlinear decision boundaries might cause the model’s decision boundary to vary significantly across small regions, leading to oversimplified recourse suggestions. We address this issue by using proximity-aware clustering and local counterfactual action generation to better approximate the decision boundary, ensuring more accurate and actionable recommendations.

Sparse data regions or outlier points might result in unrealistic, infeasible, or overly tailored recourse actions. To mitigate these challenges, we generate many clusters and diverse counterfactuals, ensuring that feasible solutions are identified without being disproportionately influenced by outliers. This approach enhances robustness and broad applicability.

Ambiguity in selecting the “optimal” action can arise when multiple actions have similar costs and effectiveness, potentially leading to overly complex recourse suggestions. We resolve this by employing predefined criteria that prioritize actionable and interpretable solutions while maintaining a balance between cost and effectiveness.

N User Study

Following the best practices outlined in [25, 9, 35], we conducted an online user study, with the following goals.

1. Assess how participants weigh trade-offs between effectiveness, average recourse cost, and size.
2. Validate our evaluation metrics, i.e., solution practicality and robustness (investigate how variance in recourse cost and effectiveness affects the participants’ decisions).
3. Assess how participants rank GLANCE relative to baselines in non-dominated solution scenarios.

We recruited 55 participants from six countries, comprising (a) PhD students and (b) researchers from various machine learning domains.

N.1 Part 1: Algorithm Ranking Task

In the first part of the study, participants were asked to rank Global Counterfactual Explanation (GCEs) produced by three methods: (a) GLANCE with $s = 3$, (b) GLOBE-CE with $s = 3$, and (c) GLOBE-CE under its default configuration (resulting in action set sizes ranging from 58 to 526). Each question presented visualizations similar to Figure 2a, showing the effectiveness, average recourse

cost, size for each GCEs together with the actions that consist the CGEs. Algorithm names were anonymized and randomly permuted to prevent identification bias. Participants were asked to select one of six possible total orderings (i.e., complete rankings) over the three alternatives presented per example.

N.1.1 Design

Each participant completed three ranking tasks based on different datasets and models. For each task, the three algorithms displayed were evaluated on the same test set and visualized identically. The key objective was to assess how participants perceive trade-offs among effectiveness, average recourse cost, and size (number of actions), and how these factors influence their preferences. The default configuration of GLOBE-CE outperformed its constrained variant with $s = 3$ in terms of both average recourse cost and effectiveness. However, it did not always outperform GLANCE across both effectiveness and cost, highlighting possible trade-offs between the size, effectiveness, and average recourse cost.

To evaluate global preferences across participants, we aggregated individual rankings using the Borda count method [14]. Each ranking position was assigned a numerical score (3 for first, 2 for second, 1 for third), and the scores were summed across participants.

N.1.2 Key Findings

- The resulting aggregated ranking was:

$$\text{GLANCE} \mid s = 3 \succ \text{GLOBE-CE} \succ \text{GLOBE-CE} \mid s = 3,$$

with total Borda scores of 473, 277, and 241, respectively, and where $a \succ b$ means algorithm a is preferred over b .

- Although GLANCE received the highest Borda score, participants expressed mixed preferences between the two versions of GLOBE-CE. The default configuration of GLOBE-CE achieved better effectiveness and cost performance than its constrained version ($s = 3$), but this came at the expense of much larger action sets (up to 526 actions), which negatively influenced participant preference.

Several participants were willing to trade off higher cost and lower effectiveness in favor of smaller and more interpretable action sets, indicating that the explanation size significantly influenced perceived utility, even when effectiveness and cost were not comparable.

- Qualitative feedback indicated that the number of actions played a critical role in participants’ decisions, even when the cost and effectiveness of larger solutions were more favorable. Many participants reported prioritizing interpretability, often trading off marginal gains in cost or effectiveness.

N.1.3 Statistical Analysis

To assess the significance of preference differences across the evaluated methods, we conducted a Friedman test followed by post-hoc pairwise comparisons. The Friedman test revealed a highly significant difference across the methods ($\chi^2 = 190.05, p < 10^{-40}$), indicating that at least one method outperforms the others.

We then applied the Nemenyi post-hoc test to compare the methods pairwise. The results show that **GLANCE** with $s = 3$ significantly outperforms both **GLOBE-CE** under default parameters ($p < 0.0001$) and **GLOBE-CE** with $s = 3$ ($p < 0.0001$). However, the performance difference between the two **GLOBE-CE** variants was not statistically significant under the Nemenyi test ($p = 0.1035$).

These results demonstrate that **GLANCE** is significantly preferred across the benchmark tasks, with consistent and statistically validated preference over the competitors.

N.2 Part 2: Pairwise Algorithm Comparison and Trade-off Reasoning

In the second part, participants were shown visualizations resembling the subplots in Figure 4, which depict the performance metrics presented in Table 1 for dataset/model combinations. Each figure depicted two anonymized algorithms with randomly permuted labels, colors, and markers to avoid bias. Participants were asked to select which algorithm they preferred and provide their main reasoning.

To support interpretation and ensure consistency in how participants viewed trade-offs, we provided a list of predefined justifications for each question. Some justifications follow, but are not limited to :

- Algorithm 1 because it has higher effectiveness
- Algorithm 1 because it has higher effectiveness and comparable cost
- Algorithm 2 because it has a smaller cost
- Algorithm 2 because it has a smaller cost and comparable effectiveness
- Algorithm 2 because it has a smaller variance in cost.

The structured reasons allowed us to assess how participants evaluate effectiveness, average recourse cost, and variance in either when comparing solutions.

Multiple comparisons were constructed to evaluate:

1. How participants respond to trade-offs between effectiveness and average recourse cost, assuming low variance.
2. Whether participants prioritize robustness (i.e., low variance).
3. Whether dominance is respected or overridden by subjective considerations.

N.2.1 Design

Each participant answered five pairwise comparison questions:

1. One involved an impractical baseline solution (e.g., DNN/Adult : **Fast Ares** vs **GLANCE**).
2. One involved a case where **GLANCE** was formally dominated, demonstrating lower effectiveness and higher cost (DNN/HELOC: **dGLOBE-CE** vs. **GLANCE**).
3. Three involved non-dominated algorithm pairs, including **GLANCE** and various baselines (e.g., DNN/German Credit: **CET** vs **GLANCE**).

Participants chose one preferred algorithm per question and selected a justification from the list. Free-text feedback was also collected to better understand reasoning.

N.2.2 Key Findings

1. In the comparison with an impractical solution, 100% of the participants preferred **GLANCE**. Of these, 77.8% stated that their decision stemmed from the low effectiveness of the baseline, not just **GLANCE**'s strength. The remaining 22.2% stated that they simply prioritized effectiveness over cost. These results validate the practicality criterion used in our experimental evaluation, as the majority of the participants deemed these solutions impractical and therefore rejected them, despite favorable cost metrics.
2. In the dominated comparison (DNN/HELOC), where **dGLOBE-CE** outperformed **GLANCE** in both cost and effectiveness, 74.5% of participants still preferred **GLANCE**, citing its lower variance. This suggests that robustness considerations can override formal dominance in human evaluation. The 74.5% preference for **GLANCE** (vs. 25.5% for baseline method) was statistically significant (binomial test, $p < 0.01$).
3. In the remaining three non-dominated comparisons, an average of 71.5% of participants preferred **GLANCE** over baseline methods. Across all non-dominated comparisons, 14.5% of participants on average selected the "smaller variance" option as their main justification for their decisions, and 27.8% of participants explicitly stated in free text feedback that robustness was critical in their evaluations.

N.2.3 Statistical Analysis

To statistically validate the superiority of **GLANCE** in pairwise comparisons, we conduct one-sided binomial tests for the three cases we previously described.

1. **GLANCE** vs. impractical solutions. Out of 55 test cases, **GLANCE** was judged to outperform the baseline in all cases. Under the null hypothesis of

no difference (i.e., a 50% chance of either method being preferred), the probability of observing at least 55 wins is $p = 2.776 \times 10^{-17}$. This result confirms that GLANCE is significantly preferred over the competing method across the benchmark ($p < 0.01$).

2. GLANCE dominated by dGLOBE-CE for DNN/HELOC. Out of 55 test cases, GLANCE was judged to outperform the baseline in 41 cases. Under the null hypothesis of no difference (i.e., a 50% chance of either method being preferred), the probability of observing at least 41 wins is $p = 0.0001776$. This result confirms that GLANCE is significantly preferred over the competing method across the benchmark ($p < 0.01$).
3. GLANCE vs. competitors in non-dominated cases. Out of 165 test cases, GLANCE was judged to outperform the baseline in all cases. Under the null hypothesis of no difference (i.e., a 50% chance of either method being preferred), the probability of observing at least 118 wins is $p = 1.564 \times 10^{-8}$. This result confirms that GLANCE is significantly preferred over the competing method across the benchmark ($p < 0.01$).

N.2.4 Participants' Preferences and Trade-offs

Even though 58.2% of the participants reported prioritizing effectiveness overall, they provided justifications that indicated that trade-offs were carefully considered. Participants were more consistent in evaluating what counts as comparable effectiveness than in judging comparable cost. Multiple participants commented on the challenge of interpreting cost without domain knowledge and difficulties in deciding if a cost difference was indeed significant. This highlights the need for domain-specific cost metrics for recourse evaluation, which can only be done by domain experts, and justifies our decision on GLANCE framework flexibility on using various distance metrics.

N.3 User Study Limitations and Future Work

This study was conducted with explainability-aware participants, including researchers and engineers familiar with machine learning terminology. Future work could replicate this user study, designed for non-expert participants, to evaluate whether preferences generalize across populations. The current results could then serve as a control baseline.