

Constrained Neural Networks for Interpretable Heuristic Creation to Optimise Computer Algebra Systems

Dorian Florescu¹ and Matthew England²

¹ University of Bath, UK

² Coventry University, UK

dmf36@bath.ac.uk, Matthew.England@coventry.ac.uk

Abstract. We present a new methodology for utilising machine learning technology in symbolic computation research. We explain how a well known human-designed heuristic to make the choice of variable ordering in cylindrical algebraic decomposition may be represented as a constrained neural network. This allows us to then use machine learning methods to further optimise the heuristic, leading to new networks of similar size, representing new heuristics of similar complexity as the original human-designed one. We present this as a form of ante-hoc explainability for use in computer algebra development.

Keywords: computer algebra; cylindrical algebraic decomposition; machine learning; explainable AI; interpretability; XAI

1 Introduction

1.1 Machine learning within computer algebra systems

Machine Learning (ML) refers to tools and techniques that learn rules from data, thus allowing a system to improve its performance on a task without any change to the explicit programming. ML underpins recent AI advances and is applied in an increasing number of domains. Mathematics is no exception: ML has been employed to directly perform mathematical computation, such as [24] who used ML to integrate expressions and solve ODEs, [2] who used ML to find the real discriminant locus, and [19] who surveys ML to predict properties from mathematical structures such as groups and graphs. However, it has been observed that mathematical reasoning is an area ML finds difficult.

Computer Algebra Systems (CASs) are not an obvious domain for ML: their unique selling point is that their answers are exactly correct and so developers are unlikely to replace symbolic computation algorithms with ML³. However, CAS algorithms often come with choices that have no effect on the mathematical correctness of the end result but can have a big impact on the resources

³ Experiments like [24] conflate two very different causes of failure: timeout and giving the wrong answer. For a CAS: the former would be a shame; the latter a disaster.

required to obtain it, and on how it is presented. Such choices are often made by human designed heuristics or “*magic constants*” [7] (sometimes not scientifically validated or even documented) but may be better made by ML.

Examples in the literature include [23] which used a Monte-Carlo tree search to find the representation of polynomials most efficient to evaluate, and [32] which used ML classifiers to pick from algorithms that compute the resultant, and [21] which used ML to decide whether to precondition input for a CAS.

1.2 Gaining additional mathematical insight from machine learning

It seems clear that ML can offer optimisation to CASs, but can it offer any further insight into the underlying mathematics / algorithms?

- [11] suggested that ML can help pure mathematicians with the development of new theorems by uncovering patterns in the data. This led to new results in knot theory and representation theory.
- [30] described a form a genetic programming where algorithms were *evolved* with a large language model performing the crossover step. This resulted in new state-of-the-art heuristics for two NP-hard problems.
- [28] trained ML to select the next S -pair in Buchberger’s algorithm to build a Gröbner Basis. An analysis of the agent showed a preference for pairs whose S -polynomials are monomials or low degree: prior human-designed heuristics for the problem considered only the S -pairs and not the polynomials themselves, so this represents a novel strategy.
- [29] described how the SHAP tool [25] may be used to analyse ML models that make a heuristic choice for a CAS and then inform *human-level* heuristics — heuristics that can be expressed in natural language in a similar amount of text as a heuristic designed by a human — that can be operated without any ML architecture.

The tool used in the final paper is from the growing field of Explainable AI.

1.3 Explainable AI

Explainable AI (often abbreviated to XAI) may be defined as those ML techniques whose decisions can be explained (at least partially). Work in the field is usually motivated by the need to error check ML decisions, and to generate greater user trust in ML. However, in the case of mathematics we hypothesise that XAI tools may be used to give give guidance or new understanding.

XAI is a new field: there have been several attempts to give a taxonomy such as [1]. One distinction in XAI methods that has firmly emerged [33] is between:

- ante-hoc explainability** which refers to ML methods that are themselves by-design transparent in their decisions; and
- post-hoc explainability** which use a secondary analysis of an opaque (i.e. black-box) ML model to generate explanations for it.

The need for the latter is driven by the so called *performance-explainability trade-off* whereby those ML techniques which allow ante-hoc explainability are thought to give lower accuracy in general. Although often presented as fact, this trade-off is disputed [31] and is likely application dependent [20]. We should also remember that explainability is inherently-audience dependent (compare explainable to an expert with explainable to the general public) [1].

SHAP is an example of the post-hoc explainability, forming its explanation through experiments involving perturbations in the input. In the present paper, we consider an alternative approach to the same application as [29], but aiming for an ante-hoc explainability approach.

1.4 Plan of the paper

The paper continues in §2 with a brief introduction to the CAS choice that we study. Then in §3 we recap a process presented in [16] to represent instances of our problem as feature vectors: suitable for use in ML. Our new contributions then follow in §4, where we interpret a well known human-designed heuristic as a small neural network, and in §5 where we search through a family of similar networks to identify an improved human-level heuristic, in effect defining a new type of ante-hoc explainability technique for such problems.

2 Our application: variable ordering choice for CAD

2.1 Cylindrical Algebraic Decomposition

Cylindrical Algebraic Decomposition (CAD) was proposed in [9] as a method to perform real quantifier elimination. Given an input in n ordered variables, CAD will decompose the corresponding real space into cells (connected regions of $\mathbb{R}^n$) arranged cylindrically (the projections of a pair of cells with respect to the variable ordering are equal or disjoint) with each semi-algebraic (described by polynomial constraints). The input to CAD is a set of polynomials and the CAD guarantees that each polynomials will have invariant sign upon each cell of the decomposition. CAD has been applied in many fields ranging from robotics [26] through biology [3] to economics [27]. However, CAD but has worst-case complexity doubly exponential in the number of variables [10] and thus any work to optimise its implementation can bring swathes of new applications into scope.

2.2 CAD variable ordering

The CAD variable ordering controls both the algorithm flow and output format (defining the cylindrical structure). It can have a huge impact, both practically [14] and in terms of theoretical complexity [6]. There exist human-designed heuristics to choose the ordering, e.g. [5], and [13] which use simple statistics of the input. Other heuristics perform increasing amounts of algebraic computation [14], [4], [34] which we do not consider here in preference for a cheap heuristic.

In the last decade ML models have also been trained to select the variable ordering for CAD. The first attempt was made by [22] with a support vector machine. Later, the present authors experimented with a wider range of models [15], methods for feature engineering [16] and improved metrics for hyper-parameter selection [17], culminating in a machine learning pipeline available to use for the task [18]. Separately [8] experimented with deep learning for variable selection.

3 Feature Generation Process

A challenge when using ML to optimise a CAS is the communication between them: the former uses symbolic expressions, and the latter vectors of numerical data called *features*. We summarise next the feature generation process of [16].

3.1 Formalising Brown’s Heuristic

Our work was based on an analysis of the **Brown** heuristic [5] which uses metrics:

1. the overall degree in the input of a variable v ;
2. the maximum total degree of monomials in which variable v occurs; and
3. the number of terms which contain the variable v .

It orders on the earlier metrics, breaking ties with the subsequent ones.

In the following we use index p to refer to polynomials in a problem instance, and index m to refer to the monomials in such a polynomial. We consider a CAD problem instance as a set of polynomials: $\mathbf{Pr} = \{\mathcal{P}_p \mid p = 1, \dots, P\}$. A generic polynomial $\mathcal{P}_p$ is then given by a sum of monomials, $\mathcal{P}_p = \sum_{m=1}^{M_p} c^{m,p} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n x_i^{d_i^{m,p}}$ where $d_i^{m,p}$ is the degree of variable x_i in monomial m of polynomial p .

Thus the polynomials are defined by the series $[c^{m,p}, (d_1^{m,p}, d_2^{m,p}, d_3^{m,p})]$, for $m = 1, \dots, M_p$. This allows formalising the problem set of all polynomials as

$$\mathbb{S}_{\mathbf{Pr}} = \{ \{ [c^{m,p}, (d_1^{m,p}, d_2^{m,p}, d_3^{m,p})] \mid m = 1, \dots, M_p \} \mid p = 1, \dots, P \}.$$

Then the three metrics of the **Brown** heuristic above are formalised as

1. $F^1(d_v) := \max_{m,p} d_v^{m,p}$,
2. $F^2(d_v) := \max_{m,p} \text{sgn}(d_v^{m,p}) \cdot (d_1^{m,p} + d_2^{m,p} + d_3^{m,p})$,
3. $F^3(d_v) := \sum_{m,p} \text{sgn}(d_v^{m,p})$.

Here $\max$ and $\sum$ are the maximum and sum functions with the subscript m, p indicating that they are applied over all monomials in all polynomials; while $\text{sgn}(x)$ is the function which takes values in $\{-1, 0, 1\}$ according to the sign of its input (used to identify which terms contain the input – in our situation the sign is only ever positive or zero).

3.2 Generating similar features

We notice that the features used by the **Brown** heuristic are simple to compute using only $\max$, $\sum$, sgn applied to degrees over monomials and polynomials. We define variants of the functions $\max_x$ and $\sum_x$ where x indicates whether we sum over monomials, polynomials or both; and we define similarly the averaging functions:

$$\text{av}_m = \frac{1}{M_p} \sum_m, \quad \text{av}_p = \frac{1}{P} \sum_p, \quad \text{av}_{m,p} = \frac{1}{P} \sum_p \frac{1}{M_p} \sum_m;$$

then we can express all the features used in [22] in this formalisation [16].

In [16] we generalised this to create a larger set of features: all those of the form $f(\mathbf{Pr}) = (g_4 \circ g_3 \circ g_2 \circ g_1 \circ h^{m,p})(\mathbf{Pr})$, where $h^{m,p}(\mathbf{Pr}) \in \{d_v^{m,p}, \text{sgn}(d_v^{m,p}), (\sum_{v'} d_{v'}^{m,p}) \mid v = 1, 2, 3\}$ and g_1, g_2, g_3, g_4 are taken from $\{\max_p, \max_m, \max_{m,p}, \sum_p, \sum_m, \sum_{m,p}, \text{av}_p, \text{av}_m, \text{av}_{m,p}, \text{sgn}, \text{Id}\}$, with Id as the identity function.

Many of the features generated will be equivalent: either at a mathematical level or for the dataset in question and so before using these for ML we should identify a unique subset. In [16] it was demonstrated that we may use these in a ML pipeline to improve the performance compared to using just a human crafted set. These features have also been the basis for further work in [29], [12].

4 Interpreting Brown's Heuristic as a Neural Network

Recall the **Brown** heuristic from Section 3.1 which used 3 rules with different priority levels. We claim this can be equivalently represented as a dense 2-layer neural network with summation activation functions, as visualised in Figure 1 for the three variable case (in the general case there will be n inputs into each of the nodes of the first layer). The summations are weighted as in Figure 1 where the weights are defined in terms $w > 0$ which we select such that

$$F^i(d_v) < w - 1, i, v \in \{1, 2, 3\} \quad (1)$$

for all problems in the dataset (or large enough to cover all problems of interest). The outputs of the first network layer are

$$y_v = F^1(d_v)w^2 + F^2(d_v)w + F^3(d_v).$$

We will show that the magnitude of y_v orders the variables as Brown's heuristic.

Assume first that $F^1(d_v) > F^1(d_{v'})$, for $v, v' \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. We aim to show $y_v > y_{v'}$ irrespective of the values of the other features. All features are positive integers, meaning our assumption becomes $F^1(d_v) \geq F^1(d_{v'}) + 1$. We start with

$$\begin{aligned} y_{v'} &= F^1(d_{v'})w^2 + F^2(d_{v'})w + F^3(d_{v'}) \\ &\leq (F^1(d_v) - 1)w^2 + F^2(d_{v'})w + F^3(d_{v'}) \end{aligned}$$




Fig. 1. Neural network inspired by Brown's heuristic

where the inequality follows by our assumption. Then by the repeated use of (1) we have the further strict inequality

$$\begin{aligned} y_{v'} &< F^1(d_v)w^2 - w^2 + (w-1)w + (w-1) \\ &= F^1(d_v)w^2 - 1 < F^1(d_v)w^2. \end{aligned}$$

Then since all features are positive we have that

$$y_{v'} < F^1(d_v)w^2 + F^2(d_v)w + F^3(d_v) = y_v.$$

Now consider the case where $F^1(d_v) = F^1(d_{v'})$ for all $v, v' \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $F^2(d_v) > F^2(d_{v'})$. We want to show that under these assumptions $y_{v'} < y_v$ for any realisations of F^3 . We proceed similarly to above:

$$\begin{aligned} y_{v'} &= F^1(d_{v'})w^2 + F^2(d_{v'})w + F^3(d_{v'}) \\ &= F^1(d_v)w^2 + F^2(d_{v'})w + F^3(d_{v'}) \\ &\leq F^1(d_v)w^2 + (F^2(d_v) - 1)w + F^3(d_{v'}) \\ &< F^1(d_v)w^2 + (F^2(d_v) - 1)w + (w-1) \\ &= F^1(d_v)w^2 + F^2(d_v)w - 1 \\ &< F^1(d_v)w^2 + F^2(d_v)w \\ &< F^1(d_v)w^2 + F^2(d_v)w + F^3(d_v) = y_v. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly in the final case where $F^1(d_v) = F^1(d_{v'})$, and $F^2(d_v) = F^2(d_{v'})$ for all $v, v' \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ and feature F^3 selects the ordering. With $F^3(d_v) > F^3(d_{v'})$

$$\begin{aligned} y_{v'} &= F^1(d_{v'})w^2 + F^2(d_{v'})w + F^3(d_{v'}) \\ &= F^1(d_v)w^2 + F^2(d_v)w + F^3(d_{v'}) \\ &\leq F^1(d_v)w^2 + F^2(d_v)w + F^3(d_v) - 1 \\ &< F^1(d_v)w^2 + F^2(d_v)w + F^3(d_v) = y_v. \end{aligned}$$

Thus the internal layer will be ordered correctly. The last layer of the network then performs weighted summations of the outputs of the first network layer, $y_v + 2y_{v'} + 3y_{v''}$, with each output neuron labelled corresponding to the weights applied to the variables (see Figure 1). If $y_v < y_{v'} < y_{v''}$ then the weighted sum $y_v + 2y_{v'} + 3y_{v''}$ is the highest among all output neurons, meaning this neural network may be used to produce the same orderings as the **Brown** heuristic.

5 Searching through similar constrained neural networks

Now we have represented the **Brown** heuristic as a (severely constrained) neural network we may consider editing this network to see if a superior heuristic of the same complexity as **Brown** can be obtained.

5.1 Feature Selection

We perform feature selection using a dataset of random 3-variable polynomial problems (as described in [18]). We generated 84 features algorithmically following Section 3 and taking all permutations this led to 19,656 possible feature triplets. For each triplet, we computed the variable ordering predicted by the neural network. The triplet that led to the shortest computing time is given by

1. $\sum_p \max_m d_v^{m,p}$, sum of the highest degree of a variable in each polynomial;
2. $\sum_p \max_m \text{sgn}(d_v^{m,p}) \cdot (\sum_{v'} d_{v'}^{m,p})$, the maximum sum of degrees of all variables for the terms in which a given variable exists; and
3. $\sum_p \max_m \text{sgn}(d_v^{m,p})$, the number of polynomials containing the variable.

We note that none of these features are in the **Brown** heuristic.

This new feature triplet was selected based on performance on random polynomials. But to judge its performance we will evaluate it on the NLSAT dataset of 3-variable polynomials from real world (non-linear arithmetic satisfiability problems) as described in [15]. The **Brown** heuristic requires a total computing time of 10,580 *s* on this dataset, while the network defined by this new triple resulted in a smaller computing time of 10,181 *s*: which is 399 *s* shorter.

5.2 Weight Tuning

We next consider changing the weights in the neural network. This will have the effect of a more complicated combination of the three features to be considered: but still weighted sums of the same three pieces of information.

We use the neural network inspired by Brown's heuristic (with $w = 30$) as a starting point. The weights are then trained on the 3-variable random training dataset using the *adam* stochastic gradient-based optimizer with learning rate $2 \cdot 10^{-5}$. From the input data we used the new three features identified in Subsection 5.1. To avoid overfitting, the performance is evaluated for each step on the independent 3-variable NLSAT dataset.

After only three epochs of training the CAD times decreased to 9908 (after which there was only minimal improvement). The weight matrix was only changed slightly, but this was sufficient to avoid the case of ties on the three metrics (followed by a random choice) which was common in the dataset.

6 Final Thoughts

This paper contributes to the ongoing conversation on how ML can contribute to computer algebra: not only algorithm optimisation but also mathematical discovery. We present an approach, constrained neural networks, that may be viewed as ante-hoc explainability. It allows for heuristics to be uncovered which are human-level in complexity. The methodology could be directly applied to other variable ordering choices in symbolic computation, and we expect it could be adapted for use on other choices also. It remains to be shown whether these more interpretable ML outputs can lead to new mathematical understanding.

Acknowledgements

DF and ME were both supported by EPSRC grant EP/R019622/1: *Embedding Machine Learning within Quantifier Elimination Procedures*. ME was also supported by EPSRC grant EP/T015748/1: *Pushing Back the Doubly-Exponential Wall of Cylindrical Algebraic Decomposition (DEWCAD)*.

References

1. Barredo Arrieta, A., Díaz-Rodríguez, N., Del Ser, J., Bennetot, A., Tabik, S., Barbado, A., Garcia, S., Gil-Lopez, S., Molina, D., Benjamins, R., Chatila, R., Herrera, F.: Explainable artificial intelligence (XAI): Concepts, taxonomies, opportunities and challenges toward responsible AI. *Information Fusion* **58**, 82–115 (2020), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.inffus.2019.12.012>
2. Bernal, E.A., Hauenstein, J.D., Mehta, D., Regan, M.H., Tang, T.: Machine learning the real discriminant locus. *J. Symbolic Computation* **115**, 409–426 (2023), [DOI:10.1016/j.jsc.2022.08.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsc.2022.08.001)
3. Bradford, R., Davenport, J.H., England, M., Errami, H., Gerdt, V., Grigoriev, D., Hoyt, C., Košta, M., Radulescu, O., Sturm, T., Weber, A.: Identifying the parametric occurrence of multiple steady states for some biological networks. *J. Symbolic Computation* **98**, 84–119 (2020), [DOI:10.1016/j.jsc.2019.07.008](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsc.2019.07.008)
4. Bradford, R., Davenport, J.H., England, M., Wilson, D.: Optimising problem formulations for cylindrical algebraic decomposition. In: Carette, J. et al. (eds.), *Proc. CISM '13*, LNCS 7961, pp. 19–34. Springer Berlin Heidelberg (2013), [DOI:10.1007/978-3-642-39320-4_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-39320-4_2)
5. Brown, C.W.: Companion to the tutorial: Cylindrical algebraic decomposition, ISSAC '04. URL <http://www.usna.edu/Users/cs/wcbrown/research/ISSAC04/handout.pdf> (2004)
6. Brown, C., Davenport, J.: The complexity of quantifier elimination and cylindrical algebraic decomposition. In: *Proc. ISSAC '07*, pp. 54–60. ACM (2007), [DOI:10.1145/1277548.1277557](https://doi.org/10.1145/1277548.1277557)

7. Carette, J.: Understanding expression simplification. In: Proc. ISSAC '04, pp. 72–79. ACM (2004), DOI:10.1145/1005285.1005298
8. Chen, C., Zhu, Z., Chi, H.: Variable ordering selection for cylindrical algebraic decomposition with artificial neural networks. In: Bigatti et al. (eds.), Proc. ICMS 2020, LNCS 12097, pp. 281–291. Springer International Publishing (2020), DOI:10.1007/978-3-030-52200-1_28
9. Collins, G.E.: Quantifier elimination for real closed fields by cylindrical algebraic decomposition. In: Proc. 2nd GI Conference on Automata Theory and Formal Languages. pp. 134–183. Springer-Verlag (1975), DOI:10.1007/3-540-07407-4_17
10. Davenport, J.H., Heintz, J.: Real quantifier elimination is doubly exponential. *J. Symbolic Computation* **5**(1-2), 29–35 (1988), DOI:10.1016/S0747-7171(88)80004-X
11. Davies, A., Veličković, P., Buesing, L., Blackwell, S., Zheng, D., Tomašev, N., Tanburn, R., Battaglia, P., Blundell, C., Juhász, A., Lackenby, M., Williamson, G., Hassabis, D., Kohli, P.: Advancing mathematics by guiding human intuition with AI. *Nature* **600**, 70–74 (2021), DOI:10.1038/s41586-021-04086-x
12. del Río, T., England, M.: Lessons on datasets and paradigms in machine learning for symbolic computation: A case study on CAD. Preprint, (2024), DOI:10.48550/arXiv.2401.13343
13. del Río, T., England, M.: New heuristic to choose a cylindrical algebraic decomposition variable ordering motivated by complexity analysis. In: Boulier, F. et al. (eds.), Proc. CASC 2022, LNCS 13366, pp. 300–317. Springer International (2022), DOI:10.1007/978-3-031-14788-3_17
14. Dolzmann, A., Seidl, A., Sturm, T.: Efficient projection orders for CAD. In: Proc. ISSAC '04, pp. 111–118. ACM (2004), DOI:10.1145/1005285.1005303
15. England, M., Florescu, D.: Comparing machine learning models to choose the variable ordering for cylindrical algebraic decomposition. In: Kaliszyk, C. et al. (eds.) Proc. CICM '19, LNCS 11617, pp. 93–108. Springer International (2019), DOI:10.1007/978-3-030-23250-4_7
16. Florescu, D., England, M.: Algorithmically generating new algebraic features of polynomial systems for machine learning. In: Abbott, J., Griggio, A. (eds.) Proc. SC² '19. CEUR-WS 2460, (2019), <http://ceur-ws.org/Vol-2460/>
17. Florescu, D., England, M.: Improved cross-validation for classifiers that make algorithmic choices to minimise runtime without compromising output correctness. In: Slamanig, D. et al. (eds.), Proc. MACIS '19, LNCS 11989, pp. 341–356. Springer International (2020), DOI:10.1007/978-3-030-43120-4_27
18. Florescu, D., England, M.: A machine learning based software pipeline to pick the variable ordering for algorithms with polynomial inputs. In: Bigatti, A. et al. (eds.), Proc. ICMS '20, LNCS 12097, pp. 302–322. Springer International (2020), DOI:10.1007/978-3-030-52200-1_30
19. He, Y.H.: Machine-learning mathematical structures. *Intl. J. Data Science in the Mathematical Sciences* **1**(1), 1–25 (2022), DOI:10.1142/S2810939222500010
20. Herm, L.V., Heinrich, K., Wanner, J., Janiesch, C.: Stop ordering machine learning algorithms by their explainability! A user-centered investigation of performance and explainability. *International Journal of Information Management* p. 102538 (2022), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2022.102538>
21. Huang, Z., England, M., Davenport, J.H., Paulson, L.: Using machine learning to decide when to precondition cylindrical algebraic decomposition with Groebner bases. In: Proc. SYNASC '16, pp. 45–52. IEEE (2016), DOI:10.1109/SYNASC.2016.020

22. Huang, Z., England, M., Wilson, D., Davenport, J.H., Paulson, L., Bridge, J.: Applying machine learning to the problem of choosing a heuristic to select the variable ordering for cylindrical algebraic decomposition. In: Watt, S.M. et al. (eds.), Proc. CISM '14, LNCS 8543, pp. 92–107. Springer International (2014), DOI:10.1007/978-3-319-08434-3_8
23. Kuipers, J., Ueda, T., Vermaseren, J.A.M.: Code optimization in FORM. Computer Physics Communications **189**, 1–19 (2015), DOI:10.1016/j.cpc.2014.08.008
24. Lample, G., Charton, D.: Deep learning for symbolic mathematics. In: Mohamed, S. et al. (eds.), Proc. ICLR '20, (2020), https://iclr.cc/virtual_2020/poster_S1eZYeHFDS.html
25. Lundberg, S.M., Lee, S.I.: A unified approach to interpreting model predictions. In: Proc. NIPS '17, pp. 4768–4777. Curran Associates Inc. (2017), DOI:10.5555/3295222.3295230
26. Manubens, M., Moroz, G., Chablat, D., Rouillier, F., Wenger, P.: Cusp points in the parameter space of degenerate 3-RPR planar parallel manipulators. J. Mechanisms Robotics **4**, 041003 (2012), DOI:10.1115/1.4006921
27. Mulligan, C.B., Davenport, J.H., England, M.: TheoryGuru: A Mathematica package to apply quantifier elimination technology to economics. In: Davenport, J.H. et al. (eds.), Proc. ICMS '18, LNCS 10931, pp. 369–378. Springer International (2018), DOI:10.1007/978-3-319-96418-8_44
28. Peifer, D., Stillman, M., Halpern-Leistner, D.: Learning selection strategies in Buchberger's algorithm. In: Daumé III, H., Singh, A. (eds.) Proc. ICML '20. PMLR **119**, pp. 7575–7585, (2020), <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v119/peifer20a.html>
29. Pickering, L., Del Rio Almajano, T., England, M., Cohen, K.: Explainable AI insights for symbolic computation: A case study on selecting the variable ordering for cylindrical algebraic decomposition. J. Symbolic Computation **123**, 102276 (2024), DOI:10.1016/j.jsc.2023.102276
30. Romera-Paredes, B., Barekatin, M., Novikov, A., Balog, M., Kumar, M.P., Dupont, E., Ruiz, F.J.R., Ellenberg, J.S., Wang, P., Fawzi, O., Kohli, P., Fawzi, A.: Mathematical discoveries from program search with large language models. Nature **625**, 468–475 (2023), DOI:10.1038/s41586-023-06924-6
31. Rudin, C.: Stop explaining black box machine learning models for high stakes decisions and use interpretable models instead. Nature Machine Intelligence **1**(5), 206–215 (2019), <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-019-0048-x>
32. Simpson, M.C., Yi, Q., Kalita, J.: Automatic algorithm selection in computational software using machine learning. In: Proc. ICMLA '16, pp. 355–360, (2016), DOI:10.1109/ICMLA.2016.0064
33. Speith, T.: A review of taxonomies of explainable artificial intelligence (XAI) methods. In: Proc. FAccT '22, pp. 2239–2250. ACM (2022), DOI:10.1145/3531146.3534639
34. Wilson, D., England, M., Davenport, J.H., Bradford, R.: Using the distribution of cells by dimension in a cylindrical algebraic decomposition. In: Proc. SYNASC '14, pp. 53–60. IEEE (2014), DOI:10.1109/SYNASC.2014.15