
Risk-Adjusted Group Data Valuation under Distribution Shift

Data-CAPM: A Diagnostic Factor Decomposition

Yingjie Bai

School of Computer Science
The University of Sydney, Australia
ybai0439@uni.sydney.edu.au

Weiming Zhi

School of Computer Science
The University of Sydney, Australia
Australian Centre for Robotics
The University of Sydney, Australia

Abstract

Data-evaluation workflows often reduce leave-one-out, Shapley-style, influence-style, or validation-guided evidence to a scalar score for each sample or group. Under distribution shift, such scores can obscure a key failure mode: a group may improve average validation utility because it carries shortcut-driven systematic exposure rather than robust contribution. We introduce Data-CAPM, a diagnostic framework for auditing dataset integrity through group-level data-valuation returns. Across evaluation scenarios, Data-CAPM decomposes each group return vector into mean return, beta, alpha, residual risk, and Alpha/Risk, making explicit whether apparent value is average, market-exposed, idiosyncratic, or volatile. The method is a factor-style audit and stress-testing tool, not a literal financial CAPM model or a universal valuation replacement. In controlled synthetic and Adult-tabular shortcut benchmarks, the shortcut group ranks first by mean return but last by alpha and Alpha/Risk; alpha-based acquisition improves robust-average balanced accuracy by 10.4 percentage points at $k = 2$. Folktables/ACSIIncome and RxRx1 official-embeddings pilots show smaller natural-metadata effects, illustrating diagnostic separation without implying performance superiority.

1 Introduction

Data valuation methods estimate which training samples or groups are helpful, harmful, redundant, or worth acquiring. Data Shapley estimates average marginal contribution over coalitions [Ghorbani and Zou, 2019]; influence functions approximate effects on predictions or losses [Koh and Liang, 2017]; DVRL learns validation-guided selection probabilities [Yoon et al., 2020]; scalable variants such as Beta Shapley and Data-OOB improve practicality [Kwon and Zou, 2022, 2023]. These methods are often consumed as scalar evidence in evaluation workflows: a high-valued data source is treated as useful, representative, or worth retaining.

This scalar interface can be incomplete under distribution shift. A data source may improve IID-like validation by exploiting a shortcut feature, yet harm shifted-slice robustness. Conversely, a rare-domain group may have modest average marginal contribution but provide distinctive value in the scenarios where it matters. Thus, existing valuation often asks *how valuable is this data?*; we ask *what kind of value does this group provide, under what evaluation scenarios, and with what risk profile?* A group can be valuable on average and still risky.

Data-CAPM treats group valuation as an evaluation methodology problem. Each group has a vector of returns across scenarios. We decompose that vector into mean return, systematic exposure beta, idiosyncratic alpha, residual risk, and alpha normalized by residual risk. The analogy to finance is operational, not literal: data groups are not assumed to satisfy market-equilibrium assumptions. The goal is diagnostic audit evidence for dataset-integrity decisions such as source acquisition, inspection, pruning, documentation, or stress testing.

Our contributions are:

1. We formulate group data valuation as an evaluative claim over scenario-wise return vectors, making validation slices, metrics, model classes, market-factor construction, and supported claims explicit.
2. We introduce Data-CAPM, a diagnostic factor decomposition of group returns into mean return, beta, alpha, residual risk, and Alpha/Risk for auditing dataset integrity under shift.
3. We stress-test scalar data-evaluation practice under controlled synthetic and real-covariate shortcut mechanisms, exposing a failure mode in which a shortcut group ranks first by mean return but last by risk-adjusted diagnostics.
4. We provide an executable evaluation suite with operational acquisition/pruning probes, sensitivity diagnostics, a 24-group stress test, and natural metadata-domain sanity checks.
5. We provide data-asset documentation and reproducibility support, including executable artifact code, resolved run configurations, a machine-readable Croissant metadata record, an evaluation card, and responsible-use guidance.

We are not aware of prior work that explicitly uses an alpha-beta-risk decomposition of group-level data-valuation returns for shortcut-sensitive auditing under distribution shift.

2 Related Work

Data valuation. Shapley-style methods estimate scalar marginal contribution over coalitions [Ghorbani and Zou, 2019]. Beta Shapley changes how contributions are aggregated across coalition sizes and is unrelated to CAPM beta [Kwon and Zou, 2022]. Data-OOB estimates value efficiently from bagging out-of-bag behavior [Kwon and Zou, 2023]. Influence functions and group influence methods approximate removal effects through local sensitivity [Koh and Liang, 2017]. Data-CAPM can be layered on such return estimators; this paper uses leave-one-group-out returns for transparency.

Validation-guided and robust valuation. DVRL learns sample values through validation-performance rewards [Yoon et al., 2020]. Our validation-model, marginal-information, and meta-reweight baselines are lightweight proxies, not faithful reproductions of DVRL’s neural estimator or reinforcement-learning loop. Distributionally robust data valuation defines value through improvement in robust generalization error [Lin et al., 2024]. Data-CAPM differs by keeping scenario-wise

utility changes as return vectors and decomposing them into exposure, alpha, and risk rather than replacing the objective with a worst-case robust utility.

Dataset auditing and shift evaluation. Datasheets, model cards, and dataset-auditing work emphasize provenance, intended use, and subgroup behavior [Gebru et al., 2021, Mitchell et al., 2019]. Distribution shift, dataset bias, and domain-generalization failures are longstanding evaluation problems [Quiñonero-Candela et al., 2008, Torralba and Efron, 2011, Gulrajani and Lopez-Paz, 2021]. Shortcut-learning and WILDS-style benchmarks show that high IID performance can reflect brittle cues [Geirhos et al., 2020, Koh et al., 2021]. Group robustness methods optimize for worst-group or domain performance [Sagawa et al., 2020]. Data-CAPM is complementary: it does not train a robust model, but audits which training groups look like robust contributors, redundant contributors, or high-exposure shortcut groups.

Factor models. CAPM and portfolio theory separate expected return from systematic exposure and risk [Sharpe, 1964, Lintner, 1965, Markowitz, 1952]. We borrow this language as a diagnostic analogy for data valuation. We do not claim financial CAPM assumptions hold for data.

3 Method

3.1 Group Returns and Market Factor

Let the training set be partitioned into groups D_1, \dots, D_G , and let $t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$ index evaluation scenarios. A scenario may include a random seed, model class, validation slice, metric, and year/domain metadata. For utility U on validation slice V_t , the leave-one-group-out return is

$$R_{g,t} = U(f_{\text{all}}, V_t) - U(f_{-g}, V_t), \quad (1)$$

where f_{all} is trained on all groups and f_{-g} is trained without D_g . Positive return means removing g hurts utility; negative return means removing g helps.

The main estimator uses a shared cross-sectional market factor,

$$R_{M,t} = G^{-1} \sum_g R_{g,t}. \quad (2)$$

The shared market keeps alpha values comparable across groups. The artifact also supports median and trimmed-mean market variants as sensitivity diagnostics, but these are not default replacements. A leave-one-out market,

$$R_{M,-g,t} = (G-1)^{-1} \sum_{j \neq g} R_{j,t},$$

is evaluated as a sensitivity check but is not the primary estimator because it gives each group a different benchmark and can remove the very shortcut factor being diagnosed.

3.2 Diagnostic Profile

For each group we compute

$$\beta_g = \frac{\text{Cov}(R_g, R_M)}{\text{Var}(R_M)}, \quad \alpha_g = \mathbb{E}[R_g] - \beta_g \mathbb{E}[R_M]. \quad (3)$$

Residual risk and Alpha/Risk are

$$\sigma_g^{\text{res}} = \text{Std}(R_g - \beta_g R_M), \quad S_g = \frac{\alpha_g}{\sigma_g^{\text{res}} + \epsilon}. \quad (4)$$

S_g is a Sharpe-like diagnostic and is labeled *Alpha/Risk*; it is not a financial Sharpe ratio. For acquisition or pruning policies that must avoid extreme systematic exposure, we also report a beta-penalized risk-adjusted selection score,

$$\text{CAPMScore}_g = \alpha_g - \lambda \max(\beta_g, 0), \quad (5)$$

with $\lambda = 0.1$ in reported experiments. This is not tuned as an optimum and is not used to retrofit alpha after seeing failures. It is the portfolio-style rule that asks for idiosyncratic contribution while

explicitly penalizing positive exposure to the shared market factor. In large cross-sections, sample covariance noise can make alpha alone less sensitive to extreme systematic risk; reporting a beta-penalized score is therefore a standard risk-adjusted selection diagnostic. The paper’s recommendation is still to inspect the full alpha-beta-risk profile, not to replace valuation with a single new scalar.

3.3 Algorithm and Complexity

Algorithm 1: Data-CAPM diagnostic decomposition
Input: groups $\{D_g\}_{g=1}^G$, scenarios $\{t\}_{t=1}^T$, utility U , return estimator, market aggregator A , beta penalty λ .
Output: mean return, beta, alpha, residual risk, Alpha/Risk, optional CAPM score.

1. For each scenario t , train f_{all} and compute $U(f_{\text{all}}, V_t)$.
2. For each group g , train or approximate f_{-g} and compute $R_{g,t} = U(f_{\text{all}}, V_t) - U(f_{-g}, V_t)$.
3. Compute $R_{M,t} = A(\{R_{g,t}\}_{g=1}^G)$.
4. Estimate $\beta_g, \alpha_g, \sigma_g^{\text{res}}$, and $S_g = \alpha_g / (\sigma_g^{\text{res}} + \epsilon)$.
5. Optionally compute $\text{CAPMScore}_g = \alpha_g - \lambda \max(\beta_g, 0)$.

Exact leave-one-group-out requires $O(T(G + 1))$ model trainings. This is practical for small source/domain audits, and the return estimator can be replaced by cached or approximate estimators without changing the downstream diagnostic schema.

Scalability and engineering extensions for auditing. The artifact exposes four optional extensions for larger or less curated audits. *Influence-style approximation* uses a first-order logistic-regression Hessian deletion update, reducing full retraining from $O(T(G + 1))$ to $O(T)$ model fits plus gradient/Hessian solves. *Market-aggregator variants* replace the mean market with a median or trimmed mean as sensitivity checks. *Beta shrinkage* smooths noisy group beta estimates toward the cross-group mean in many-group settings. *KMeans auto-grouping* creates provisional groups when source labels are unavailable. The main mechanism study uses exact returns and predefined groups for transparency; Appendix F reports numeric boundary checks for market construction and scaling hooks. The exact-LOGO mean-market and mild beta-shrinkage settings preserve the central shortcut warning, while median-market and influence-approximation checks expose important failure modes. We therefore treat these variants as sensitivity diagnostics rather than default replacements.




Figure 1: Conceptual diagnostic map. Positive alpha suggests value beyond the shared scenario market; high beta suggests systematic exposure. The beta threshold is a visualization aid and is not calibrated across datasets. Labels are audit prompts, not automatic keep/drop decisions.

4 Experimental Design

Controlled synthetic benchmark. We construct six groups: core clean data (G_0), redundant core data (G_1), rare clean data (G_2), OOD clean data (G_3), label-noise data (G_4), and spurious shortcut data (G_5). Validation has IID, rare, OOD, and spurious-shift slices. The default setup uses 5 seeds, 2 model classes, and 4 validation slices, yielding $5 \times 2 \times 4 = 40$ return observations per group.

Adult controlled shortcut benchmark. We use UCI Adult Income covariates and labels [Becker and Kohavi, 1996], then inject controlled rare/OOD/noise/shortcut group mechanisms. This is mechanism validation on real tabular covariates, not natural shortcut discovery. Across three dataset seeds, each run uses two evaluation seeds, one model class, and four validation slices.

Natural metadata-domain pilots. Adult workclass, Folktables ACSIncome [Ding et al., 2021], and RxRx1 official embeddings [Sypetkowski et al., 2023] use naturally defined metadata groups without injected shortcuts. These pilots are sanity checks, not fairness audits, batch-quality rankings, or state-quality rankings; full details are deferred to Appendix D.

Operational probes and baselines. Acquisition selects top- k groups and evaluates robust average balanced accuracy over rare, OOD, and spurious-shift slices. Pruning removes bottom- k groups and retrains. Baselines include mean return, leave-one-group-out ranking, loss-based ranking, worst-slice return, random ranking, validation-guided proxies, meta-reweight-lite, approximate group Shapley, and an oracle used only as an upper bound.

5 Results

5.1 High Mean Return Can Hide Shortcut Exposure

Table 1 and Figure 2 show the main synthetic result. The shortcut group G_5 _spurious ranks first by mean return but last by alpha and Alpha/Risk. Its beta is 6.88, indicating strong systematic exposure to the shared return market; after this exposure is accounted for, its alpha is negative. The rare and OOD clean groups have the strongest alpha/Alpha-Risk ranks despite lower mean returns.

Table 1: Synthetic Data-CAPM scores. Lower rank is better.

Group	Mean	Beta	Alpha	Alpha/Risk	R_m	R_α	R_S
G3_ood_clean	0.0189	-0.2680	0.0225	0.5820	2	1	2
G2_rare_clean	0.0142	-0.5463	0.0217	0.7438	3	2	1
G0_core_clean	-0.0016	-0.1735	0.0008	0.0671	5	3	3
G4_label_noise	0.0018	0.1757	-0.0006	-0.0913	4	4	4
G1_redundant_core	-0.0025	-0.0717	-0.0015	-0.1426	6	5	5
G5_spurious	0.0512	6.8839	-0.0429	-1.4173	1	6	6




Figure 2: Empirical alpha-beta map on the synthetic benchmark. The x-axis uses a symmetric log scale so the high-beta shortcut and low-beta rare/OOD groups remain visible. Marker area is proportional to residual risk.

Across 10 synthetic dataset seeds, $G2$ and $G3$ appear in the top two by alpha in every run, while $G5_spurious$ appears in the bottom two by alpha in every run and is ranked first by mean return in every run. Sensitivity sweeps over label noise, rare-group size, spurious strength, and spurious-shift strength preserve bottom-two alpha and Alpha/Risk ranks for $G5_spurious$ (Appendix Table 6). Bootstrap and market-factor diagnostics are summarized in Appendix Table 7.

5.2 Mechanism Validation on Adult Covariates

On Adult with controlled shortcut intervention, the same alpha-beta pattern appears on real covariates. The spurious group ranks first by mean return and last by alpha across three dataset seeds; its average beta is 7.48 and average alpha is -0.0388 (Table 2). This supports the mechanism claim while preserving the boundary: the shortcut is injected.

5.3 Operational Consequences

When mean return is misled by the shortcut group, risk-adjusted acquisition improves robust average performance. Alpha, Alpha/Risk, CAPM score, and diversified alpha-beta choose the same top- k groups in the six-group benchmark, so their scores coincide; the equality is a property of this benchmark, not a general equivalence.

Table 2: Adult controlled shortcut benchmark, $G5_spurious$ over three dataset seeds.

Statistic	Mean	Beta	Alpha	Alpha/Risk	R_m	R_α	R_S
Mean	0.0255	7.4760	-0.0388	-3.8372	1.0000	6.0000	5.6667
Std.	0.0066	0.4065	0.0084	2.3111	0.0000	0.0000	0.5774

Table 3: Operational probes. Synthetic acquisition reports robust-average balanced-accuracy delta versus mean-top- k . Pruning reports delta versus full-data training.

Setting	Method	k	Delta	Selected/removed group evidence
Synthetic acquisition	Alpha top- k	2	0.1038	selects $G2, G3$, avoids $G5$
Synthetic acquisition	Alpha/Risk top- k	2	0.1038	same top-2 as alpha
Synthetic acquisition	CAPM top- k	2	0.1038	same top-2 as alpha
Synthetic pruning	alpha	1	0.0131	removes $G5$ first
Synthetic pruning	mean return	1	0.0021	removes $G1$, not $G5$
Adult pruning	alpha	1	0.0305	removes $G5$ first
Adult pruning	mean return	1	0.0134	removes $G4$, not $G5$

Validation-guided proxy baselines also demote $G5_spurious$ in the synthetic benchmark. This is a useful outcome, not a failure: Data-CAPM is not the only way to detect the shortcut. Its distinctive value is the explanatory profile: high mean return, high beta, negative alpha, high residual risk, and poor Alpha/Risk.

5.4 Natural Metadata-Domain Sanity Checks

Natural metadata pilots on Adult workclass, Folktables/ACSIncome state domains, and RxRx1 experimental batches give weaker, smaller signals than the controlled shortcut benchmarks. In ACS and RxRx1, absolute effects are only on the order of 10^{-3} , so we make no end-to-end accuracy-improvement claim. The value of these pilots is diagnostic: even without injected shortcuts, mean contribution, systematic exposure beta, and idiosyncratic alpha separate into different profiles; detailed tables and alpha-beta plots are in Appendix D.

5.5 Failure Modes

Leave-one-out market CAPM can fail in the six-group benchmark by ranking $G5_spurious$ first by alpha. Removing the dominant shortcut group from its own market also removes the shortcut factor, making the group appear idiosyncratically valuable. The shared market is therefore the primary estimator.

In a 24-group synthetic stress test, $G5_spurious$ has mean-rank 1.0 by mean return, 10.4 by alpha, 7.6 by Alpha/Risk, and 24.0 by CAPM score; its beta is 21.9. Alpha alone becomes less stable because the larger cross-section dilutes the market factor and increases covariance-estimation noise. The beta-penalized CAPM score should therefore be read as a risk-adjusted portfolio-selection diagnostic for large data pools, not as an ad hoc patch to rescue a ranking. This motivates reporting the full profile rather than using alpha as a universal scalar.

Sensitivity diagnostics show that the central exact-LOGO warning is stable under the default shared market and mild beta shrinkage, but not under all market or approximation choices. In particular, a median market can promote the shortcut group in the six-group setting, and the influence approximation does not reproduce the exact-LOGO shortcut ranking under non-smooth balanced accuracy. These failures motivate reporting the full alpha-beta-risk profile and keeping exact LOGO with a shared arithmetic market as the primary estimator.

6 Limitations and Responsible Use

No CAPM literalism. Data-CAPM is a factor-model analogy and diagnostic decomposition, not a claim that data markets satisfy financial equilibrium assumptions.


```

--folktables_dataset_seeds 0 1 2 \
--folktables_models logistic_regression random_forest \
--folktables_n_train_per_group 1200 \
--folktables_n_validation_per_slice 1000 \
--output_dir results_folktables_acs

```

The RxRx1 official-embeddings audit can be regenerated without downloading raw images:

```

cd data_capm_experiment
bash experiments/rxxrx1_batch_audit/scripts/run_rxxrx1_auto_download_mac_paper_min.sh

```

This downloads only the public RxRx1 metadata and official deep-learning embeddings to an ignored cache under `experiments/rxxrx1_batch_audit/outputs/`, then runs the 24-domain, 31-class, 3-seed embeddings-first exact-LOGO audit. Controlled and Folktables-suite outputs include the core CSVs `group_returns.csv` and `capm_scores.csv`; operational summaries such as `portfolio_paired_deltas.csv` and `bad_group_pruning_summary.csv`; sensitivity outputs such as `sensitivity_summary.csv`; generated tables under `paper/generated_tables/`; PNG figures under `paper/latex/figures/`; and a resolved `run_config.json`. RxRx1-specific outputs are written under `experiments/rxxrx1_batch_audit/outputs/` and include `rxxrx1_group_returns.csv`, `rxxrx1_group_returns_with_market.csv`, `rxxrx1_capm_scores.csv`, `rxxrx1_audit_summary.csv`, `rxxrx1_pruning_probe.csv`, `selected_samples.csv`, `class_counts.csv`, `domain_counts.csv`, `class_domain_counts.csv`, `manifest.json`, `run_config.json`, `figures/rxxrx1_alpha_beta_map.png`, and `paper_generated/rxxrx1_audit_section.md`. Appendix F ablations can be regenerated with:

```

python scripts/build_appendix_f_numeric_ablation.py \
--input_returns results_workshop_final/group_returns.csv \
--output_dir results_ablation \
--beta_shrinkage_value 0.1 \
--include_influence true

```

The table script reuses stored exact-LOGO returns for the market and shrinkage rows to avoid unnecessary retraining. Full retraining commands for optional market and influence hooks are documented in the artifact README.

LLM usage. LLMs were not part of the proposed Data-CAPM diagnostic method, evaluation metric, baselines, experimental decision process, or result interpretation. LLM assistance was used for implementation support, code refactoring, plotting and table-generation scripts, artifact documentation, and language polishing. Synthetic data and reported results were produced by the released experiment scripts rather than by LLMs as generative experimental subjects. All LLM-assisted code paths, experiments, tables, figures, references, and claims were reviewed by the authors, who retain final responsibility for the artifact and paper.

References

- Barry Becker and Ronny Kohavi. Adult [dataset]. UCI Machine Learning Repository, 1996. URL <https://archive.ics.uci.edu/dataset/2/adult>.
- Frances Ding, Moritz Hardt, John P. Miller, and Ludwig Schmidt. Retiring adult: New datasets for fair machine learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 34, pages 6478–6490, 2021. URL https://papers.nips.cc/paper_files/paper/2021/hash/32e54441e6382a7fbacbbbf3c450059-Abstract.html.
- Timnit Gebru, Jamie Morgenstern, Briana Vecchione, Jennifer Wortman Vaughan, Hanna Wallach, Hal Daumé III, and Kate Crawford. Datasheets for datasets. *Communications of the ACM*, 64(12):86–92, 2021.
- Robert Geirhos, Jörn-Henrik Jacobsen, Claudio Michaelis, Richard Zemel, Wieland Brendel, Matthias Bethge, and Felix A. Wichmann. Shortcut learning in deep neural networks. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 2:665–673, 2020.

- Amirata Ghorbani and James Zou. Data shapley: Equitable valuation of data for machine learning. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2242–2251, 2019. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v97/ghorbani19c.html>.
- Ishaan Gulrajani and David Lopez-Paz. In search of lost domain generalization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- Pang Wei Koh and Percy Liang. Understanding black-box predictions via influence functions. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1885–1894, 2017. URL <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v70/koh17a.html>.
- Pang Wei Koh, Shiori Sagawa, Henrik Marklund, Sang Michael Xie, Marvin Zhang, Akshay Balsubramani, Weihua Hu, Michihiro Yasunaga, Richard Lanus Phillips, Irena Gao, Tony Lee, Etienne David, Ian Stavness, Wei Guo, Berton Earnshaw, Imran Haque, Sara M. Beery, Jure Leskovec, Anshul Kundaje, Emma Pierson, Sergey Levine, Chelsea Finn, and Percy Liang. WILDS: A benchmark of in-the-wild distribution shifts. In *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 5637–5664, 2021. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v139/koh21a.html>.
- Yongchan Kwon and James Zou. Beta shapley: A unified and noise-reduced data valuation framework for machine learning. In *Proceedings of The 25th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 8780–8802, 2022. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v151/kwon22a.html>.
- Yongchan Kwon and James Zou. Data-OOB: Out-of-bag estimate as a simple and efficient data value. In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 18135–18152, 2023. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v202/kwon23e.html>.
- Xiaoqiang Lin, Xinyi Xu, Zhaoxuan Wu, See-Kiong Ng, and Bryan Kian Hsiang Low. Distributionally robust data valuation. In *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 235 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 30362–30391. PMLR, 2024. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v235/lin24t.html>.
- John Lintner. The valuation of risk assets and the selection of risky investments in stock portfolios and capital budgets. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 47(1):13–37, 1965.
- Harry Markowitz. Portfolio selection. *The Journal of Finance*, 7(1):77–91, 1952.
- Margaret Mitchell, Simone Wu, Andrew Zaldivar, Parker Barnes, Lucy Vasserman, Ben Hutchinson, Elena Spitzer, Inioluwa Deborah Raji, and Timnit Gebru. Model cards for model reporting. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pages 220–229, 2019.
- Joaquin Quiñero-Candela, Masashi Sugiyama, Anton Schwaighofer, and Neil D. Lawrence, editors. *Dataset Shift in Machine Learning*. MIT Press, 2008. ISBN 9780262170055. doi: 10.7551/mitpress/9780262170055.001.0001.
- Shiori Sagawa, Pang Wei Koh, Tatsunori B. Hashimoto, and Percy Liang. Distributionally robust neural networks for group shifts: On the importance of regularization for worst-case generalization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.
- William F. Sharpe. Capital asset prices: A theory of market equilibrium under conditions of risk. *The Journal of Finance*, 19(3):425–442, 1964.
- Maciej Sypetkowski, Morteza Rezanejad, Saber Saberian, Oren Kraus, John Urbanik, James Taylor, Ben Mabey, Mason Vectors, Jason Yosinski, Alborz Rezazadeh Sereshkeh, Imran Haque, and Berton Earnshaw. RxRx1: A dataset for evaluating experimental batch correction methods. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshops*, pages 4285–4294, 2023. URL https://openaccess.thecvf.com/content/CVPR2023W/CVMI/html/Sypetkowski_RxRx1_A_Dataset_for_Evaluating_Experimental_Batch_Correction_Methods_CVPRW_2023_paper.html.
- Antonio Torralba and Alexei A. Efros. Unbiased look at dataset bias. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 1521–1528, 2011.

Jinsung Yoon, Sercan O. Arik, and Tomas Pfister. Data valuation using reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 10842–10851, 2020. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v119/yoon20a.html>.

A Evaluation Claims

Table 4 summarizes how the diagnostics should be interpreted. Each quantity supports a limited evaluation claim under explicit assumptions; none is an intrinsic group-quality label.

Table 4: Interpretation guide for Data-CAPM diagnostics.

Quantity	Claim it can support	Required assumption	Does not support
Mean return	The group improves average utility over chosen scenarios.	The scenario mixture reflects intended use.	Robustness or shortcut safety.
Beta	The group co-moves with the shared scenario-level market.	The market factor captures meaningful common movement.	Causal proof of shortcut use.
Alpha	The group contributes beyond beta-scaled market movement.	Relevant shifts and stress tests are included.	Universal data value.
Residual risk	Market-adjusted contribution is volatile.	Enough scenarios estimate variance.	A keep/drop decision.
Alpha/Risk	Alpha scaled by residual volatility.	Residual risk is an appropriate scale diagnostic.	A financial Sharpe ratio.
CAPM score	A beta-penalized audit ranking.	The fixed penalty is an explicit diagnostic choice.	An optimal policy.

B Evaluation Card

Table 5: Evaluation card for the Data-CAPM artifact.

Field	Documentation
Scope	Diagnostic group-level auditing of data-source, domain, or cohort contributions under explicitly defined evaluation scenarios. The artifact supports controlled shortcut stress tests, Adult mechanism validation, Folktables/ACS metadata-domain pilots, RxRx1 official-embeddings batch audits, and user-provided grouped tabular or embedding features.
Primary claims	Scalar mean-return valuation can overvalue shortcut-driven groups under distribution shift; scenario-wise return vectors can be decomposed into mean return, beta, alpha, residual risk, and Alpha/Risk to make data-value claims more interpretable and stress-testable.
Assumptions	Groups and validation scenarios must be meaningful for the deployment question; utilities should reflect intended use; the shared market factor should summarize common scenario movement; low alpha/high beta is an audit signal, not a causal proof.
Limitations	The main evidence is group-level and strongest under controlled shortcut interventions. The method does not learn groups by default, does not replace sample-level valuation, and does not prove natural shortcut discovery or universal superiority over validation-guided baselines.
Responsible use	Do not interpret low alpha as evidence that a population, state, hospital, user cohort, or demographic group is intrinsically low value. Use diagnostics to trigger inspection, documentation, fairness analysis, and domain review before acquisition or pruning decisions.
Reproducibility	The archive includes run scripts, fixed seed lists, resolved <code>run_config.json</code> files, generated CSVs/figures, optional Folktables commands, and a Croissant metadata record for the evaluation suite.

C Sensitivity and Statistical Diagnostics

Table 6: Sensitivity sweep summary. Values are minimum fractions across the tested settings within each sweep; higher is better for all fraction columns.

Sweep	#	G5 bottom-2 α	G5 bottom-2 A/R	G5 top-1 mean	G2/G3 top-2 α	Notes
label noise sweep	4	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	stable shortcut demotion
rare-group size sweep	4	1.000	1.000	0.800	1.000	stable shortcut demotion
spurious strength sweep	4	1.000	1.000	0.400	0.200	stable shortcut demotion
spurious-shift strength sweep	4	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	stable shortcut demotion

Table 7: Statistical diagnostics for the shortcut group G5_spurious.

Diagnostic	Default result	Stability summary	Interpretation
default rank profile	mean return rank 1/6; alpha rank 6/6; Alpha/Risk rank 6/6	bootstrap mean-rank CI [1.0, 2.5]	G5 is top-ranked by mean return but bottom-ranked by risk-adjusted diagnostics.
bootstrap CI for beta bootstrap CI for alpha	6.845 [6.289, 7.333] -0.043 [-0.058, -0.031]	CI remains strongly positive CI remains below zero	G5 has high systematic exposure. G5 has negative idiosyncratic value under the shared market.
bootstrap CI for Alpha/Risk lambda sweep for CAPM score	-1.461 [-2.080, -1.043] G5 CAPM rank 6/6	CI remains below zero Ranks across lambda values: 6	Risk-adjusted alpha is poor. The six-group shortcut demotion does not require tuning lambda.
scenario-weighting sensitiv- ity return-normalization sensi- tivity	shared default alpha rank 6/6 none: alpha rank 6/6; z-score: 4/6; centered: 1/6	alpha ranks [6]; Alpha/Risk ranks [6] scenario-centering can reverse the diagnosis	G5 remains bottom-ranked under simple slice reweightings. Centering removes the shared market factor and is treated as a warning, not the main estimator.
shared vs leave-one-out market	shared alpha rank 6/6; leave-one- out alpha rank 1/6	leave-one-out market can fail	The primary estimator uses a shared market so alpha is comparable across groups.

D Natural Metadata-Domain Pilots

Adult workclass and Folktables/ACSIncome use naturally defined metadata groups without injected shortcuts or label noise. These are sanity checks, not fairness audits and not evidence of natural shortcut discovery.

Table 8: Adult workclass pilot over three dataset seeds. Lower rank is better.

Group	Mean	Beta	Alpha	Alpha/Risk	R _m	R _α	R _S
self-employed	0.0086	-0.6802	0.0148	1.0441	2.0	1.0	1.0
government	0.0068	0.3591	0.0008	0.1727	3.0	2.3	2.3
private	0.0394	3.4586	-0.0029	-0.1432	1.0	2.7	2.7
other	-0.0014	0.8625	-0.0127	-1.7190	4.0	4.0	4.0

Table 9: Folktables ACSIncome state-domain benchmark. Groups are U.S. states used as natural metadata domains; lower ranks are better. These are data-source audit signals, not value judgments about states or populations.

Group	Mean	Beta	Alpha	Alpha/Risk	R _m	R _α	R _S
acs_CA	0.0010	1.1617	-0.0006	-0.1882	2.3	2.3	2.7
acs_FL	0.0013	1.2375	0.0003	-0.2791	2.3	2.3	2.3
acs_NY	0.0001	0.7632	-0.0010	-0.2580	3.0	2.7	2.3
acs_TX	0.0016	0.8376	0.0013	0.4024	2.3	2.7	2.7

RxRx1 official-embeddings batch audit. We also run an embeddings-first audit on the public RxRx1 official deep-learning embeddings [Sypetkowski et al., 2023]. RxRx1 contains repeated experimental batches and is designed to study technical batch variation in cellular microscopy. We restrict to HUVEC, use experimental batch as the group/domain, use `sirna_id` as the label, and evaluate held-out validation samples from each selected batch. The paper-minimum run uses 24 batches, 31 classes, 3 random seeds, and 24 held-out validation domains, yielding 72 return observations per group, 1,728 LOGO return entries, and 1,800 total classifier fits including full-model fits. This is a natural official-embeddings batch-audit sanity check, not a claim that a batch is intrinsically high or low quality.

The RxRx1 effect sizes are modest: the top alpha group, HUVEC-05, has mean return 0.0025, beta 1.58, and alpha 0.0016, while HUVEC-09 has the highest beta (1.62) but negative alpha (-0.0007). Low alpha or high beta should not be read as evidence that an experimental batch is intrinsically low quality; it is an audit signal under the selected official-embedding representation, classifier, and held-out-domain scenario design. The pruning probe is directional and small: removing the bottom two groups by alpha or Alpha/Risk changes the robust-average validation score by 0.0019 on average,




Figure 3: Folktables ACSIncome state-domain pilot. Marker area is proportional to residual risk. This is a metadata-domain diagnostic, not a state-quality ranking.

Table 10: RxRx1 official-embeddings batch audit. Groups are HUVEC experimental batches; scenarios are 3 random seeds \times 24 held-out validation batches, for 72 return observations per group. Lower ranks are better. Values are small natural-metadata audit signals, not intrinsic biological batch-quality labels. Full residual-risk and CAPM-score diagnostics are provided in `rxrx1_capm_scores.csv`.

Group	Mean	Beta	Alpha	Alpha/Risk	R_m	R_α	$R_{A/R}$
HUVEC-05	0.0025	1.5826	0.0016	0.1341	1	1	6
HUVEC-13	0.0015	0.9684	0.0009	0.2357	2	2	1
HUVEC-18	0.0015	1.2299	0.0008	0.1691	3	3	4
HUVEC-07	0.0010	0.5661	0.0007	0.1836	6	4	3
HUVEC-15	0.0011	0.8714	0.0006	0.2129	5	5	2
HUVEC-24	0.0013	1.4477	0.0005	0.1384	4	6	5
HUVEC-09	0.0002	1.6155	-0.0007	-0.1745	17	21	21
HUVEC-20	-0.0001	1.0712	-0.0007	-0.1972	21	22	22
HUVEC-23	-0.0007	0.5977	-0.0010	-0.3448	23	23	23
HUVEC-01	-0.0010	0.8930	-0.0015	-0.4750	24	24	24




Figure 4: RxRx1 official-embeddings batch audit. Groups are HUVEC experimental batches; marker area is proportional to residual risk. The plot shows modest but interpretable separation between alpha and beta profiles on official embeddings. HUVEC-09 is a high-beta, negative-alpha audit candidate, while HUVEC-05 has both high beta and high alpha, suggesting market-exposed but useful contribution under this evaluation design. These are inspection signals, not biological quality labels.

whereas random pruning is negative in this run. We read this as evidence that Data-CAPM provides a batch-audit profile on official embeddings, not as an end-to-end performance superiority claim.

E Supplementary Operational Results




Figure 5: Synthetic robust-average group acquisition. The y -axis averages balanced accuracy over rare, OOD, and spurious-shift slices.




Figure 6: Synthetic pruning robust-average deltas. Pruning removes groups from low value to high value.

Table 11: Supplementary synthetic $k = 2$ pruning comparison.

Method	Removed k	Delta	Removed Groups	Bad Removed
alpha	2	0.0178	G5, G1	G5
Alpha/Risk	2	0.0178	G5, G1	G5
CAPM score	2	0.0114	G5, G4	G5, G4
validation-model proxy	2	0.0114	G4, G5	G4, G5
mean return	2	-0.0310	G1, G0	none
loss-based	2	-0.0202	G4, G2	G4

F Ablation on Alternative Market Aggregators and Scaling Extensions

Table 12 reports numeric boundary checks rather than a robustness proof. The goal is to test whether the main shortcut warning is an artifact of the default arithmetic-mean market. The exact-LOGO mean-market result is preserved under mild beta shrinkage, while the median-market and influence-approximation rows expose settings where the alpha or Alpha/Risk ranking alone can fail. These failures support the paper’s recommendation to inspect the full alpha-beta-risk profile rather than replacing valuation with any single scalar.

The 10% trimmed-mean row is included as an implementation check rather than a substantive robustness test, because in the six-group setting this trimming level removes no groups and therefore matches the arithmetic-mean result.

Table 12: Numeric Appendix F boundary checks on market construction and scaling hooks. Values use the six-group synthetic benchmark. Exact LOGO rows reuse the 40 stored return observations (5 seeds \times 2 models \times 4 slices). G2 denotes the rare-clean group, G3 the OOD-clean group, and G5 the spurious shortcut group. For the mean-market and shrinkage rows, the top two alpha groups are G3 and G2; for the median row, G5 is incorrectly promoted, which is the intended boundary-condition warning. The 10% trimmed-mean row is an implementation check because, with six groups, this trimming level removes no group. The influence row is a fast logistic-regression-only smoke check and is not used as primary evidence.

Configuration	rank(mean)	G5 beta	G5 alpha	rank(alpha)	G5 A/R	rank(A/R)	rank(CAPM)
Exact LOGO + mean	1	6.8839	-0.0429	6	-1.4173	6	6
Exact LOGO + median	1	8.1568	0.0824	1	0.7810	1	6
Exact LOGO + trimmed mean	1	6.8839	-0.0429	6	-1.4173	6	6
Exact LOGO + shrinkage 0.1	1	6.2955	-0.0348	6	-1.1013	6	6
Influence approx.	4	0.7891	0.0001	4	0.2063	4	3

The ablation records two important boundary conditions. First, a median market is not automatically safer in a very small, skewed group universe: it makes G5_spurious appear positive-alpha, although the group still has extreme beta and a bottom CAPM-score rank. We therefore treat market aggregators as sensitivity diagnostics, not as default replacements. Second, the influence-approximation hook is retained as an engineering smoke check rather than primary evidence. In the LR-only check, it does not reproduce the exact-LOGO shortcut ranking under non-smooth balanced accuracy, so we do not use it to support the main empirical claim.

G Implementation Extension Checks

The released artifact contains engineering hooks for scaling studies, including influence-style approximation, alternative market aggregators, beta shrinkage, and KMeans auto-grouping. Exact commands and supported argument names are documented in the artifact README. These hooks make the audit pipeline extensible, but the primary claims remain tied to the controlled exact-LOGO mechanism study with the shared arithmetic market.